

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF INSANITY.

---

**VOL. XVI.**

**UTICA, APRIL, 1860.**

**No. 4.**

---

## ESSAYS, CASES, AND SELECTIONS.

---

### THE PLEA OF INSANITY IN CASES OF HOMICIDE, AS ILLUSTRATED IN THE TRIAL OF SAMUEL S. RICH.

At a special term of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, holden at Barnstable in December 1859, Samuel S. Rich, a native of Wellfleet, was tried for the murder of his father-in-law, Ebenezer Ward. No issue being made in regard to the commission of the deed, which had been freely acknowledged by the prisoner, the plea of insanity was adopted as the sole ground of defence. The establishment of the following points was attempted :—

First, the existence of hereditary predisposition to insanity in both branches of the prisoner's ancestry. Secondly, an exceedingly low grade of intellect in the prisoner from birth, as illustrated by the history of his life. Thirdly, the operation of causes known to be powerful agents in the production of insanity. Fourthly, the existence, for a short period before the homicide and afterwards, of a delusion having a direct relation to the deed committed. And finally, the presence of epilepsy from an early period of the prisoner's life.

Dr. Stedman, formerly of the Boston Lunatic Hospital, and Dr. Choate, of the State Lunatic Hospital at Taunton, were examined as experts, and, after a minute consideration of all the circumstances

of the case, agreed in an opinion sustaining the sanity of the prisoner, who was finally convicted of murder in the second degree, and sentenced to imprisonment for life.

#### THE HOMICIDE.

It is seldom that a murder is committed under circumstances of greater atrocity and deliberation than in the case under consideration. Mr. Ebenezer Ward, the victim of the bloody deed, a man sixty-five years of age, occupied with his family, consisting of his wife, daughter (the wife of the prisoner,) and her two children, a small one-story house in the town of Wellfleet, a fishing village near the extremity of Cape Cod, a place of singular quiet and immunity from all violent acts and disturbances of the peace, no trial for a capital offence having previously occurred in the County for the past thirty-five years. On the second of May, of the past year, the family retired to rest at the hour of nine: Mr. Ward occupying a small bedroom on the only floor, adjoining the kitchen; Mrs. Ward and the children sleeping in another bedroom on the opposite side of the kitchen; and the daughter, who had been recently confined, having a bed in the sitting-room, which also communicated with the kitchen. At about midnight a brick was thrown violently through the window of Mr. Ward's room, breaking the sash, and alarming the whole household. The aroused family immediately gathered in the sitting-room, where they remained in great excitement and anxious suspense for half an hour, speculating upon the motives of the disturbance, and fearing to investigate its origin. At the expiration of this time another missile was thrown with great violence through the kitchen window, and, as Mr. Ward incautiously stepped to the door between the kitchen and sitting-room, in the latter of which rooms was a light, thus exposing his person to observation, the muzzle of a gun was thrust through the kitchen window, an explosion followed, and the husband and father dropped upon the floor in the midst of his affrighted family, bleeding from a deadly wound. The dismay and terror of the wife and daughter were so intense, that without waiting to examine more particularly into the condition of the prostrate victim of violence,

they seized the two children, and fled to the attic, where they bolted themselves in, and remained till morning. At sunrise, the neighbors who were called in found Mr. Ward dead, with a charge of shot in his right breast, and the other marks of violence described above. In the yard at the back of the house, it was found that a horse-cart had been drawn up to a short distance from the back door, and the body tipped up in such a manner as to lead to the supposition that it might have been intended as a shelter, from which to attack any one who should come out at the door to ascertain the cause of the throwing of the missile. A pitchfork taken from the barn and placed by the side of the cart, seemed to favor the same supposition. For some reason which does not very clearly appear, suspicion was immediately attached to Rich, who was arrested early upon the morning following the murder, readily confessed his guilt, and was placed in confinement to await the action of the Grand Jury.

#### HISTORY, HABITS, AND CHARACTER OF THE PRISONER.

Samuel S. Rich was born in Wellfleet, in the year 1832. His parents were in quite humble circumstances, his father gaining a livelihood by serving as a common seaman in small fishing and coasting vessels. Samuel is represented as having been for the first two or three years of his life a feeble child, but after that time his physical condition improved, and he became a robust and in the main a healthy boy, and is now a powerful man. He early manifested an exceedingly roving disposition, was disinclined to attend school, or to perform any work which his parents desired of him, was extremely impatient of control and difficult to manage, and showed little susceptibility to the influence of either punishment or reward. To so great a degree did this wayward and roving disposition manifest itself, that at the age of five years his father was induced, partly as a punishment, and partly as a means of restraint, to procure a chain and fetters, and secure him in this way to the bedstead, in which position he was kept without intermission for several weeks. It is difficult to conceive that in this enlightened age and community a father could have been so misguided (to use the mildest term) as

to resort to such means of discipline and restraint, in a child of such tender years. Those who know the evil results of such practice upon the adult, can best appreciate what would be its probable effect upon the unfolding mind and forming morals of childhood. The fact is introduced here however, rather to show the character of the boy, than to exhibit the influences under which his character was built up. At school he does not appear to have been considered a dull boy, but was a constant truant, and during his infrequent attendance was entirely neglectful of study. He learned to read pretty well, but went no further. About the age of six years he began to manifest the most remarkable propensity of his life, the imitation of horses. At first this seems to have been merely a boyish sport. The other boys would harness him up, put bits in his mouth and drive him through the village, while his imitations of equine movements, paces and habits would afford them amusement. Unlike the other boys however, he did not as he approached manhood leave off playing horse. But even after he had arrived at mature years he was often seen in the streets of the town either tied to a post, and impatiently champing his bit, and stamping his feet, and calling with loud neigh to other more genuine animals, or trotting with measured step, and imitating in every possible manner the action of his favorite quadruped. The testimony of one very intelligent witness so fully illustrates this propensity, that it will be worth while to relate it in detail. A highly respectable farmer of Wellfleet, whose credibility is unquestioned, testified that on one occasion, about three years before the commission of this homicide, as he was going to work in a piece of woods, he was surprised at hearing in a place where such sounds were unusual, the loud neighing of a horse. Curious to investigate the origin of the sound, he proceeded a short distance through the woods, till coming to an open space he found in this secluded situation the prisoner fastened by a halter to a tree. Concealing himself carefully from observation, he watched closely his movements for three quarters of an hour. At first the tethered mimic only displayed the movements of an impatient horse, stamping the ground, drawing back upon his halter and then starting for-



wards and neighing. But after a while he began to pull more steadily backwards upon the halter, till finally by the aid of a dexterous movement of the head, it slipped over that member, and he was at liberty. Throwing up his heels and with a loud snort he darted off, exhibiting all the symptoms of delight and excitement common to the equine race under such circumstances, and began to course rapidly around in what the concealed witness likened to a race-track, which he had marked out upon the field. As he encircled this at rapid pace, now running at full speed, and anon imitating the more moderate action of the trot, he passed near the spot where the amused and astonished observer of his sport was lying in wait. Catching sight of the strange and unexpected object, he shied from the track, and, as if spurred on by affright, with head erect but turned slightly over his shoulder towards the object of alarm, he rushed on with redoubled speed. After a time the witness of these strange proceedings came out from his hiding-place, addressed him, and asked him to accompany him home, which he readily did, conversing well and intelligently by the way. At this time he was twenty-five years of age. Many other similar instances are related as having occurred in his childhood and youth, and he seems to have become well known for miles around for his singular propensity, and his wonderful powers of imitation. Several times when in a boat with his comrades, he has asked to be set on shore, and has gone through similar performances. At other times, taking the shells of the quahog in his hands, he has run upon all fours upon the hard sand, imitating with great exactness the footprints of his equine model. Upon a cross-examination of several of the witnesses it came out, that although the horse was the most frequent and favorite subject for the exercise of his mimicry, yet he also imitated with great effect wild and tame birds, hogs, cows, musical instruments, negroes, and in short almost any thing which struck his fancy.

As a boy and as a man he was idle and somewhat dissolute in his habits. He went several voyages in fishing vessels, and also with his father in a coaster, but he went always with great reluctance, ran away from his vessel at every convenient opportunity, and was

finally discharged from the latter employment as entirely untrustworthy. On shore he worked occasionally at driving team, and at general farm-work. The testimony of his employers sufficed to show that when a constant watch and oversight was kept upon him he was a good workman, doing a full day's labor and doing it well, but that at every opportunity when left to himself he shirked work, and perhaps left it entirely. There is no evidence that he was of a blood-thirsty, cruel, or revengeful disposition. No one considered him quarrelsome, no one looked upon him as dangerous. Timid in his character, he never became engaged in any personal conflicts, preferring to yield even to those of less physical force than himself. He appears never to have received any moral or religious training whatever, living for the most part in the streets of the small maritime town where his parents dwelt. The habit of masturbation was formed, as testified by his father, at an early age, and was probably continued to manhood, although on this point there is no direct evidence. There was also occasional indulgence in liquor, although on the whole he was a temperate man. From early childhood his father testified that he was subject to "fits," though of what nature was not very clearly indicated. The physician who had practised many years in the family, at one time being in constant, almost daily attendance upon his mother, knew nothing of them. The same was true of an adult member of his father's family. Two only of these attacks are described, one of which, related by his aunt, occurred in childhood. In this he was observed to fall upon his hands and knees in the yard, and to struggle for a long time in vain to rise. She watched him from the window for half an hour, but did not think it necessary to go to his assistance. He finally succeeded in gaining his feet, and bolting over the fence, finished by having a horse-caper. The other instance occurred after he had grown up. Two maiden sisters, living alone in a retired house, were startled one evening by seeing in the dusky light a man on his hands dragging himself up towards their dwelling. Affrighted they rushed from the house and procured the assistance of a neighbor, who, upon arriving at the scene of their alarm, found Rich in the position described, and ap-

parently suffering from a total loss of power in the lower extremities. Rich talked well and sensibly as usual, and informed them that while walking along the road a quarter of a mile off he suddenly fell to the ground, and found that he had lost the use of his lower limbs. After rubbing his feet, and applying what they supposed to be proper restoratives without effect, they procured a cart, wrapped him up in blankets, and conveyed him home. The next day he came himself to return the borrowed articles, apparently in his usual health.

CIRCUMSTANCES MORE IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING THE COMMISSION OF THE DEED, AND MORE OR LESS INTIMATELY CONNECTED WITH IT.

About a year before the homicide Rich married the daughter of Ebenezer Ward, his victim. She was at that time a woman of tarnished reputation, having an illegitimate child two years of age. They went to live in a dilapidated house in the outskirts of the town, where he seems to have in some way supported himself and her through the summer, and where, for aught we know, they lived in peace, and with some degree of comfort. His idle and shiftless habits were too confirmed, however, to allow him to make adequate provision for the approaching winter, and the expected confinement of his wife seemed to make it imperative upon either their relatives or the legal guardians of the poor to assist them. After several conferences between Rich, his father, his father-in-law, and the Selectmen of the town, it was decided that his wife should be boarded at her father's during the winter at the expense of the town, and that Rich should shift for himself. This was not agreed to without violent threats on the part of the prisoner, who swore that he would have the heart's blood of any one who interfered between himself and his wife. After one of these conferences with the Selectmen Rich destroyed his furniture, threw out of the windows all his slender stock of provisions, and was found groping about among the wreck of his household utensils by his father and uncle. As they entered the dwelling, they found that he was cursing the Selectmen, and he exclaimed as they approached; "Damn Ben. Oliver!",—one of the legal guardians who had been most active in his affairs. After a short time they persua-

ded him to go with them to his father's house. He appeared to be highly excited, and his relatives in describing his appearance dwell much upon his wild and flashing eye, and flushed face. On the way home across the beach, it being a moderately dark night, he began to walk on tiptoe, saying that they were walking in water, which was not the case, and soon afterwards jumped, saying they were crossing a ditch. After this he proceeded quietly home with them, and retired to bed as usual. In a few days his wife was moved to her father's house, where a child in a short time was born to this unfortunate couple. Rich continued to visit his wife occasionally, but was forbidden by her father to pass the night at his house, he distinctly declaring his intention to prevent any resumption of the marital relations between the parties. From this time Rich became more moody and sullen, neglected work of all kinds, wandered off much by himself, and had all the appearance of a man brooding over a deep injury. Shortly before the commission of the homicide his feelings were still further exasperated by a report which was brought to him, that another man, the father of the child which had been born to his wife before their marriage, was allowed to visit her. Of this he complained most bitterly, and in a most revengeful spirit. At about this time occurred the tragedy at Washington, which occupied so large a share of the public attention, and the accounts of which in the public press Rich read with great avidity and interest, during the week previous to the murder. The evening before the deed he spent mostly in the house of his aunt, which adjoined his father's dwelling, and it was there noted that the sullen demeanor, which had attended him since his separation from his wife, had given place to a certain degree of excitement and nervousness, not in any way different however from what might be expected in the manner of a man, who knew that he had immediately before him the execution of so terrible and momentous a work. After his retiring to rest that night nothing further was known of his movements till three o'clock the next morning, when his uncle was aroused from sleep by a knocking at his door, and upon arising found Rich, who said to him; "I have killed father Ward." His uncle treated the matter as a joke, and told him

to go home, which he then did. He did not immediately retire to bed, but before doing so, saw his father, and said to him: "If any one comes for me, tell them I am in bed." When he arose, two or three hours later, he walked out on a hill adjoining the house, where he was observed by his father passing backwards and forwards. In answer to his father's interrogations he finally confessed to him the deed, and returned to the house. In a short time the sheriff was seen approaching. He made no attempt to escape, but arose and shook hands with him, and enquired if he wanted him. Upon being told by the officer with what crime he was charged, he made no denial, but said: "They dishonored me; they have taken away my wife." While awaiting his examination before a justice he was visited by a clergyman, who spoke to him of the enormity of the offence, which he had committed, and the terrible position in which he had placed himself. To him also he stated his wrongs, and also said that his mind had been much troubled about his domestic affairs, and that at about noon, the day before the murder, the impression came upon him from God that he should take his father-in-law's life, and that now that he had done it a great load was removed from his mind, and he felt easier than he had done for many a day. After his examination he was removed to the jail, where he remained until the time of his trial. During the early part of his stay there he had several attacks of what were called "his fits." These were not so clearly defined and described, as to enable any one to pronounce with certainty upon their character. His physician was of opinion, that without being well-marked attacks of epilepsy, they were epileptiform in their nature. The only one which came directly under his observation was marked by partial muscular contractions, without complete insensibility, the attacks recurring at short intervals for several hours. Another attack was described by the other occupants of his cell to commence with great rigidity of the limbs, followed by a performance of his horse-antics, this in turn succeeded by a falling fit, and the latter giving place to great violence, during which it required the united strength of five or six men to hold him in his berth. After one of these attacks too he tore his clothing, and committed



other mischief in his cell. Upon being visited at the jail a short time after his incarceration, he exhibited generally the appearance of robust health. His habit is full, his complexion florid, his countenance and especially his eyes bright, and his bodily strength is apparently more than that of ordinary men. His conversation on all subjects touched upon at that time was intelligent and clear, and evinced about as much mind as could be expected, considering his neglected education. Upon being questioned about the murder, he replied that he knew nothing about it, that the time during which it happened was all a blank to him, and that his head at that time had troubled him a great deal. Upon learning that matter, and introducing the subject of his separation from his wife, he displayed the feeling of having received the deepest injury, and spoke in an excited and revengeful manner of Mr. Ward and the Selectmen of the town. He was easily excited, and his manner betrayed considerable anxiety and nervous trepidation. During his trial he bestowed close attention at times to the testimony, and evinced by his manners and appearance a good deal of anxious interest in the result. When called upon to speak, if he had anything to say in addition to the plea of his counsel, he arose and addressed a few words to the jury, declaring his utter ignorance of the whole crime, which had been laid to his charge, in language intelligible and as well chosen as could have been expected from him.

#### HEREDITARY PREDISPOSITION.

Insanity was clearly shown to have existed in the families both of his father and his mother; particularly in the former. The grandfather of his mother was chained as a maniac for many years. His father's brother, grandfather, and grandfather's brother were shown to have been in like condition. His father was a man of at least ordinary intelligence for one in his situation, but easily excited and overcome by any shock to his feelings. His mother is a hypochondriac, and has been of late confined entirely to the house, and usually to her bed.

## REMARKS.

It is evident from the account given of this case, that it is not to be classed with those where the plea of insanity is seized upon as the last hope of a desperate cause, less from a belief in the truth of the plea than from a knowledge that no other can stand. There are certainly many circumstances connected with the fatal event, and many traits and habits exhibited in the course of the life of the accused, which rendered it imperative upon those having charge of his defence to make a thorough investigation of all facts bearing upon the condition of his mind. And a very careful consideration of these can alone afford, even to the most experienced, the ability to give a decided opinion in the case. In weighing the somewhat doubtful and conflicting evidence, it seems proper to examine the case essentially in two different methods. First, to take all the facts and circumstances together, and see if they can be reconciled with any one form of mental disease; and secondly, to consider separately those phenomena which appear to be more important to the issue, and see whether each can be best explained upon the supposition of disease, or upon that of merely vicious education, low habits, and revengeful passions.

And first let us consider whether, taking all the testimony together, as to his history and character, and the facts of the homicide, they are consistent with any one known form of mental unsoundness. It is very easy for any one to say, that there was evidently always something different about him from other men. And a superficial view would be apt to confirm the opinion of insanity. That he was naturally of a low order of intellect also, is evident from all the testimony. With the passing away of the years of childhood he did not, like other boys, altogether put away boyish things, but continued to practise some of the sports which are usually forsaken as the mental and physical powers arrive at maturity.

But in order to sustain the defence of not guilty by reason of insanity, it is evident that we must assume either that he was by nature so imbecile and of such imperfect mind as to excuse him from the consequences of his acts, or else that he was suffering, at the

time of the commission of the deed, from an attack of some acute form of mental disease. Now, imbecility is a form of mental imperfection, which is of course constant in its manifestations. An imbecile is one always. The disease has no remissions, no intervals, no variations in the amount of mental development exhibited. It is evidently, therefore, a form of mental unsoundness which can most readily be detected upon examination by a person skilled in the phenomena of similar conditions of mind. That Rich showed none of it during a careful and lengthy examination at the jail, but on the other hand exhibited a fair amount of intelligence and considerable information, is evidence enough of itself that he does not belong to this class. That he had a sense of wrong when inflicted upon himself is evident enough. That he felt that he possessed certain rights which had been invaded is plain. And the fact that he found it necessary to justify himself in any way for the deed which he had committed, shows conclusively that he was aware that he had performed an act wrong in itself and subjecting him to punishment, and to screen himself from the consequences of which he must offer a powerful excuse. He was undoubtedly in some respects a person of weak mind. He was timid, without force of character, easily influenced, of strong animal passions, and of great vanity. The two latter peculiarities had undoubtedly much to do in disposing him to the perpetration of the crime which he committed. His passion for his wife seems to have been the only approach to an attachment which he ever exhibited; and the desire to resume his marital relations appears to have been so strong that thwarting it became a reason for revenge of the most diabolical character. The propensity to call attention to himself by his acts was evidently strong from early youth. The applause which followed his successful imitations and mimics, the attention which they called to him, and the importance which they gave him, were without doubt in the highest degree gratifying to him, and can alone account for the continuance of such sport so long after the period of life to which it was appropriate had passed away. Upon such a mind it is not difficult to conceive the injurious influence which might be exerted by

reading the Sickles' trial, particularly considering the circumstances in which the prisoner was at that time placed. Nor should it be accounted wonderful if his own wrongs seemed to him in some respects parallel, and likely to awaken the same sympathy and secure the same impunity which were awarded to the hero of that tragedy.

If we can fairly come to the opinion that Rich was not by nature of that infirm intellect which should shield him from the consequences of crime, it remains to be considered whether we can reconcile the facts of the case with the supposition that he was suffering, at the time of the homicide, under an attack of acute disease. Acute mania is, of course, out of the question. Its symptoms would have been manifold and obvious to any eye. It was stated that he slept well at that time, and that on the night after the murder he slept quietly several hours. No bodily derangement was manifested. His appetite was as usual. He was dull in his demeanor, in all respects behaving as we should suppose a man would who was brooding over wrongs which had been inflicted upon him. The wild and flashing eye which was supposed by his friends to be all-important, and which he really possesses in an unusual degree, we know means absolutely nothing. No other appearance seems to be stated by those who were in daily intercourse with him, denoting any peculiar or diseased condition of his mind. The deliberation and care with which the deed was committed, not inconsistent with chronic imbecility, which is often strangely associated with shrewd cunning, is eminently so with acute disease.

Is there any evidence, that the act was committed under the influence of an insane delusion? In the first place it may be remarked, that it is now generally conceded that a delusion never occurs without some other symptoms of insanity, usually of a marked character. But if it is really present, and is strong enough to impel a man to the performance of a deed under other circumstances the most repugnant to all his feelings, would he not strongly display it both before and after the act of violence? Would he not, inasmuch as it is a reality to him, and a perfect justification of his conduct, state it in self-defence, not once and coldly, but warmly, vehemently,

and always? When in connection with these considerations we take the fact that he had a real cause of grievance, which perhaps he magnified by brooding over it, and that he had threatened the very deed of blood itself in case this wrong were done him, can we entertain the idea for a moment, that such a delusion as the statement made to the clergyman after his arrest would indicate, could possibly be the master-motive of his actions?

The particular circumstances which appear most worthy of separate and careful consideration in the case, would seem to be his conduct after his arrest in not attempting escape or concealment; his various ill turns in the jail, and, taken in connection with them, the "fits," which he is reported to have had from an early period of his life; and the illusions of sense, which he apparently had after the acts of violent rage at his own house, when the subject of his wife's removal from him was being agitated.

With regard to the first it may be remarked, that although it is undoubtedly true as a general rule that sane people do endeavor to escape and conceal their misdeeds, while insane persons do not, yet there are very many exceptions to this. On the one hand, there are many imbeciles, as we are all aware, who in spite of general weakness are endowed with wonderful cunning and secretiveness, and display remarkable skill in hiding all traces of their offences. If such commit a homicide, they are very likely either to conceal it or to escape. On the other hand, we have only to turn to the instance already alluded to in the history of this case, and which seems in a certain degree to have served as a model for it and an incentive to it, to obtain an example of a man undoubtedly sane committing a deed of blood without hope or attempt at concealment or evasion. The two homicides in the prison of this State, a few years since, afford similar examples. There seems to be in some minds the possibility of arousing the passions of hatred and revenge to such a pitch of intensity that all other considerations except their gratification are disregarded. And sated passion brings with it a supreme indifference to all earthly or other interests.

The ill turns at the jail, represented by his physician to resemble



epilepsy yet not to be epilepsy, and accompanied by various peculiar manifestations, next deserve attention; and in investigating their character it will be well perhaps to consider in connection with them the so-called fits, which he was said to suffer from through life. It is hardly possible that these were of one character previously to his incarceration, and of another afterwards. It might well be taken for granted that they were identical in their nature. Now of these earlier attacks but two are described with any attempt at accuracy. It is certain that neither was epilepsy, nor, if accurately described, do they correspond with any known form of disease. The last one consisted in a temporary loss of power in the lower limbs, sudden, complete, and entirely recovered from in a few hours. The attack at the jail, noticed by the physician, consisted of a succession of partial convulsions, lasting several hours. But throughout there was never perfect insensibility, never general convulsions, no biting of the tongue, no acceleration or disturbance of the pulse. Another is described by his fellow prisoners as alternating with mimicries, with violence, with laughing. Now it is well known that epileptiform seizure, or imperfect epilepsy, is not uncommon; but is it not unheard of that such attacks should continue for several hours in succession? Would we not necessarily expect in a case of such severity the full muscular convulsion, the complete insensibility, and all the involuntary, self-inflicted injuries which accompany the disease? Again, is it not worth considering whether this young man, prone beyond most of his race to mimic, and accustomed to imitate the crow, the horse, the negro, in short any thing which particularly attracted his notice, and vain of the attention which it called to him, would not be at least equally likely to imitate epilepsy? Accustomed in childhood to roam the streets instead of attend school, he would have inevitably found a model, and almost as certainly would have exerted his powers of imitation in copying it.

It remains for us to consider the walk in the night from his own house to his father's across the beach with his father and uncle, during which he appeared to imagine that they were walking in water when they were not, and that ditches yawned before them which

really did not exist. These phenomena appear equally inexplicable whether we accept the theory of his sanity or his insanity. Illusions of the sense of sight like these are not very common in insanity, and when they do occur are invariably connected with some very general functional disturbance, or with disease of the brain which would manifest itself in many other symptoms. For instance, they occur in delirium tremens, in acute mania, or in organic lesion. Standing by itself however, occurring only once, and being both preceded and followed by rational actions and conversation, it can hardly be explained upon the supposition of any known form of disease, and we are forced to leave it with the strong probability of mistake in the account, or of intentional deception.

It is rarely the case that so many circumstances are collected together which upon a superficial view of them point strongly towards the insanity of the party, but which bear so poorly the test of rigid analysis and scrutiny. Yet it can not be doubted that the verdict of guilty was a strictly righteous one; strictly in accordance with the law and with the facts of the case, under the strict application of the acknowledged laws of mental disease.

The philanthropy which of necessity attaches itself to the performance of the sacred duties of our profession, inclines its members on all occasions to take the charitable view of criminal cases, whenever it is tolerably well supported. But it is not impossible that we may err equally in this direction as in the opposite, and, by rendering the establishment of the plea of insanity too easy, may be fully as derelict in our duty to humanity as by being too cautious in the reception of testimony. The effect of punishment, in controlling vicious men and preventing crime, depends so much upon the certainty of its execution that he who opens another loophole for escape, through mistaken views of charity and kindness, is doing a wrong to society and mankind. It behooves all therefore who are called upon to assist in the examination of such cases, to exercise the utmost caution, to weigh with the most minute exactness every symptom, and to arrive at their conclusions only after the most rigid application of the laws of disease.

## THE ÆSTHETICS OF SUICIDE.

[*From Winslow's Journal of Psychological Medicine, Oct. 1859.*]

"The suicide does not undergo death because it is honourable, but in order to avoid evil."—ARISTOTLE.

"Do you know [said Socrates] that all except philosophers consider death among the great evils?"

"They do indeed," [Simmias answered].

"Then do the brave amongst them endure death, when they do endure it, through dread of greater evils?"

"It is so."

"All men, therefore, except philosophers, are brave through being afraid and fear; though it is absurd that any one should be brave through fear and cowardice."—PLATO.

In the north room of the Royal Academy, at the last Exhibition, there was hung a painting, the subject of which was somewhat singular. It represented a garret, within which was depicted, sitting at the edge of a truckle-bed, a young man whose countenance had a scared aspect. At his feet, upon the floor, sat a woman, her form huddled together, her head resting upon his knee, and her face hid by her arms. Nigh at hand, in front of an overturned stove, was a little heap of fiercely-burning charcoal, and on a table, in the corner of the room, might be distinguished the butt-end of a pistol. Through a curtainless window could be seen the tops of green trees, and a patch of blue sky, while the pale light of early morning, or of the closing even-tide, and the fiery glow of the burning charcoal, lit the scene. We have described the picture from memory, and may perhaps have erred in some of the slighter details, but the chief characteristics were such as we have given.

The artist had done his work featly, and it did not need a second glance to see that he had fixed upon the canvass, with no contemptible skill, a too-common phase of every-day life, suicide. But what

recent or sometime past instance of double suicide so far appealed to our sympathies, or what description of such an event in literature stood so markedly prominent, from the excelling power of the writer, that the pencil should add a halo to the ghastly incident, or to the writer's pen? We turned to the catalogue, but appended to the number of the painting there was simply this sentence:—"The Fumes of Charcoal." On the walls of the same Academy, a few years before, Wallis's wonderful painting of Chatterton's self-murder had hung. This suicide, however, the wretched end of one of the most conspicuous examples of misdirected genius that the world ever saw, claims a place in history. Of the limner's representations of every-day suicide, we know Mr. Decamp's horrible but nervous drawing, a young man wasted by suffering and half naked, is extended upon a wretched bed, in an equally wretched attic. A blanket, the sole clothing, envelops the body. The head has fallen backwards, and the long, trailing, entangled hair is dabbled with blood. One hand reposes on the breast, the other rests flaccidly upon the floor. Near the bed lies a still smoking pistol, while against the wall lean an easel and a palette, upon which the colors are still moist. On a rough-hewn plank above the easel are arranged a few books, and alongside them stand a plaster statuette, and a death's head. This painting is simply termed "*The Suicide*," and in no wise is the terrible story which it tells, or the terrible lesson which it conveys, mitigated or distorted. We know also Cruikshank's too-truthful drawing, the last of the series named "*The Drunkard's Children*," a sequel to "*The Bottle*." Who has not shuddered when he gazed upon the agonized figure, which, with the hands convulsively clasped upon the eyes, has sprung from the parapet of the bridge? How vividly the mind pictures to itself the sullen wash of the river against the piers; the dark, glassy surface of the water in the huge, black shadow of the masonry; the golden gleam of the moonshine on the distant ripples. How involuntarily we shiver at the thoughts of the chilly, damp air which hovers over the stream, and sicken at the awful sense of solitariness which is apt to steal over one when, standing on one of the bridges, he is hemmed in by the midnight sounds of the city. Alas for the

friendless who at such an hour and in such a spot may listen to them!\*

Then the sharp, painful recoil of the feelings, as the slight, scarcely-heard splash, strikes the ear from below, and the eager gaze with which we peer into the gulf, and mark the two or three pale, fleeting gleams of silver light which crest the diminutive waves, tossed up by the cloven waters. "God keep the poor unfortunate!" we exclaim. Rather should we cry "*God keep us*"—to read aright, and to act aright after having read, the legend written beneath the picture—"The maniac father, and the convict brother are gone!—The Poor Girl, homeless, friendless, deserted, destitute and gin-mad, commits self-murder!"

"Alas! for the rarity  
Of christian charity  
Under the sun!  
Oh! it was pitiful!  
Near a whole city full,  
Home she had none."

We know also that little sketch of Thackeray's which illustrates "*A Gambler's Death*." It is but a roughly-executed drawing, but it is *taken from nature*, and, set in the tale to which it belongs, is of surpassing interest. (See the *Paris Sketch-Book*.) Decamp's, Cruikshank's, and Thackeray's drawings tell the rigid, ghastly truth of every-day suicide; and the drawings of the two latter men convey a lesson not easily overlooked or forgotten, and free from a certain terrible fascination, which rivets the attention to the painting of the former man, even from its very truthfulness. But "*The Fumes of Charcoal*" is a picture which, judging from its title and execution, aims at depicting suicide from an æsthetical point of view. The horrible character of the act is partly overshadowed by a certain un-

\* "When I first saw the river as I passed over King's College Bridge," said Robert Hall, speaking of the Cam, to Dr. Olinthus Gregory, "I could not help exclaiming, Why, the stream is standing still to see the people drown themselves! and that, I am sorry to say, is a permanent feeling with me." How many, doubtless, are affected by a very similar feeling on looking at night upon the Thames, where it winds within the metropolis—a feeling often increased, if not originally prompted by the sad associations connected with the bridge. It is to be feared that many who have been foiled at every turn in life's struggle, have become fascinated with the terrible idea, and yielded to it.



healthy sentiment, and the painting appeals to a morbid sympathy rather than to a sound feeling of abhorrence tempered with an active and well-directed pity.

We may be wrong in our estimate of the artist's work, and we hope we are. It may, moreover, be simply an illustration of peculiar notions on his part of the functions of the painter's art; but we can not help regarding this painting as one of several indications, which seem to point to a growing sympathy towards the act of suicide in this country.

Our coroner's juries have been so sensitive of the fame of suicides, that (so far as can be judged from newspaper reports\*) the rule is to pronounce a verdict of temporary insanity in cases of self-murder. This legalized apology for suicide is not only too often an invasion both of the law and the gospel, but it tends to throw discredit upon the doctrine of temporary insanity, and, what is even still more important, to convert the act of suicide into an object of legitimate pity.

We have no special literature of suicide in England at the present time, but our Gallic neighbors supply us in this respect superabundantly. With them suicide holds a very similar position in popular writings, and is invested with the same kind of sentiment as "broken hearts," and consumption with us.

We meet with self-murder at every turn in some of the most popular and widely-spread forms of French literature, and the act is clad with so many charms of a highly æsthetical character, and altogether takes so respectable a position among the legitimate causes of death, that one recoils in fear from the insidious doctrines (absurd though they may be) implied or taught.

Witness the *Mémoires d'un Suicide recueillis et publiés par Maxime du Camp*, (Paris, 1855;) and the more recent work, *Les Suicides Illustres; biographie des personnages remarquables de tous les Pays qui ont péri volontairement depuis le commencement du monde jusqu'à nos jours, par F. Dabadie*. (*Première Série, Paris, 1859.*) Charles Nodier had conceived the notion of writing

\*Can not Mr. Samuel Redgrave help us to some more definite and satisfactory information upon this subject?

the biography of noted Suicides, and reading to us the "solemn philosophical lesson" which is to be derived from the string of renowned artists, poets, inventors, legislators, heroes, conquerors, kings, queens, emperors, priests, and lovers who have murdered themselves. "It is singular," remarks M. Sartorius, in prefatory notice to M. Dabadie's work, "that for the last thirty years we have been swamped with celebrated brigands, celebrated kings, celebrated wives, celebrated children, celebrated animals, &c., but no one has recounted the tale of celebrated suicides. Thanks, however, to M. Dabadie, this much to be regretted hiatus in the French book-trade has been (by our advice) filled up."

We have the book, but the solemn philosophical lesson, and the biographical research, which would have legitimized its place in literature are wanting. "*Les Suicides Illustres*" appeal to the *dilettanti* in suicide.

In his introduction to the work M. Dabadie, after having touched in a slipshod fashion upon several opinions respecting suicide, writes:—

"Morality—we speak of social not religious morality [happy distinction!] which has nothing to do here—morality, we say, which is elevated above the law by its origin, its function, its end, and which moves in a more extended sphere, justly disapproves of certain suicides. For example, every married man has contracted a sacred engagement; he owes help and protection to the woman he has espoused, as also to his children. This engagement having been freely entered into, one thing only can dissolve it—the radical and definitive impossibility of fulfilling it. Thus the father of a family who is or can be useful to it, is blamable if he disembarass himself of that life which does not belong to him.

"To recall this incontestible principle is to demonstrate that man has not *always* the right to kill himself. But universal opinion would be wounded and we are tempted to add morality (!) if it were sustained that he has *never* the right. In truth, in the eyes of opinion, there are suicides which are not only excusable but even praiseworthy. Such is the suicide of the commandant of a fortification or of a ship which he blows up rather than render it to an enemy. Orators, poets, and celebrated historians, as well as heroes, soldiers and sailors, who have had the bravery to accomplish this resolution, are admired by the people, and the church dare not refuse to pray for the health of their souls. More than once it has happened that

suicide has been the brevet of glory. Witness those Greeks and Romans who fell so nobly *that death was proud to take them* according to the magnificent expression of the English poet; and without going so far back, the young officer of our Navy (Brison) who immortalized himself in the waters of the Archipelago, under the Restoration.

"As to the vulgar suicides, it appears to us better to pity than to blame them. Rich or poor, old or young, ill or well, man is bound to existence by so many ties—without noticing the bond of habit—that he must have suffered cruelly before conceiving the idea of destroying himself, especially before realizing it. \* \*'" (pp.xxv-xxvii.)

Let it not be supposed that notions such as these are maintained by obscure writers solely. We may mark an approximation to them in a recent expression of opinion by one who has an enviable position among physicians, and whose scientific writings on suicide have a world-wide reputation—Brierre de Boismont. In the course of an inquiry into the suicidal or accidental nature of an injury which had occasioned the death of a gentleman in Paris in September, 1868, M. Pinard, the substitute of the procureur impériale, said :—

"We are not of those too-austere legislators who without pity for the dead would gibbet the bodies of suicides, and drag them through the streets upon a hurdle.\* We live, on the contrary, in the midst of an enfeebled society which beholds with indifference the multiplication of suicide, and which regards it more with pity than with anger. Does society look upon self-murder as a good or an evil? To listen to certain doctrines and to witness the ravages of this evil extending into all classes of society, we should say that it has doubts in this respect, and that it forgave all those who had recourse to it. Neither need we wonder at these doubts when we meet with poets who say to distempered souls, Death is a sleep; rest ye and break the vase if the liquor is too bitter: when we encounter more hardy minds who proclaim to all that death is a right, and the disinherited may quit a world that has abandoned them. Against this double cry of feebleness and pride it is necessary that we should maintain the old principles that have been taxed as common-place (as if common-places were not eternal truths,) that suicide which arises from madness is a calamity, that when it is committed by a sane person it is a crime.

\* "1598, February 20. The 20 day of Februar, Thomas Dobie drownit himself in the Quarrel holes, besyde the Abbey, and upon the morne he was harlit throw the towne backword, and thereafter hangit on the gallows."—*Robert Birrel's Diary.—Notes and Queries, Vol v, P. 272.*

"Is not suicide a protest against the life to come, a protest against the immortal principle we carry in us, a protest against the social duties which we have given rise to, and which we ought to fulfil to the end? Then ought every flourishing society to guard against this disease of eternal faith. Then ought magistrates always to regard suicide as a disgrace, a crime to be engraved on a tomb, a dishonor bequeathed to a family."

Upon these opinions M. B. de Boismont remarks:—

"We are keenly affected by these noble and generous words, but do they not admit of any exceptions?

"Philip Strozzi had fallen into the hands of his most cruel enemy, Come de Medicis, whom he had wished to overturn. He was one of a body of conspirators, of whom he possessed the secrets. If he spoke, their heads would roll upon the scaffold, their property would be confiscated, their families proscribed and reduced to indigence, and his name and himself would be dishonored. If he had but to meet an ordinary death his silence would not be shaken, but torture might triumph over his courage, as it had triumphed over that of the unfortunate Julian Gondi and many others, and cause him to forswear himself. He would not brave a like peril. Filled with the learning of the ancients, whose works had been recently disinterred after many ages of darkness, and had electrified Italian imaginations, he descended to the tomb, invoking the name of Cato and of those virtuous men who had likewise killed themselves. If Strozzi be criminal, his crime is of a nature every way peculiar, because his memory does not lack the sympathies of many men, and his memory will always be respected.

"In the midst of the agitations which disturb the world, perhaps there would be fewer villanies, and more great actions, if those who are called to play a part upon the political scene took the resolution to die rather than to abandon the triumph of their ideas, or preferred honour to life. 'There are epochs,' says M. S. De Sacy, 'when to die with readiness is a noble science; and if christianity from a more elevated point of view condemns absolutely suicide, after the courage of maintaining life in obedience to God, it must be admitted that there is no greater courage than that of quitting it voluntarily in order to avoid being sullied by a baseness.'"  
*(Recherches Médico-Legales sur le Suicide à l'occasion d'un case douteux de mort accidentelle ou violente. Par M. B. de Boismont. Annales d'Hygiène Publique. July, 1859.)*

M. B. de Boismont's reasoning would leave a tolerably wide path open, and an ample verge capable of unlimited enlargement, for suicide. For who is to lay down those rules which would enable

us to determine with precision the circumstances where suicide becomes not merely justifiable but even praiseworthy? Honor and the world's opinion are not synonyms of virtue, as the world goes, and to take them as guides would leave us in precisely the same predicament that the world has been in with regard to suicide ever since it began to play a conspicuous part in history.

If M. Boismont's *in-extremis* doctrine of political conduct were adopted, it is evident that it would not be the *ideas* contended for, but the success or not of those ideas which must govern the act of self-murder, for the doctrine is applicable to every shade, every variety of belief entertained by politicians. Think for a moment of Louis Napoleon struggling against the evils of penury, of expatriation, nay, of seemingly hopeless exile, in a back street of London; his most cherished notions crushed; his greatest efforts not merely unsuccessful, but a mark of ridicule. Picture to yourself this man discovered one morning, amidst all the bustle and hurry of the huge city, stretched upon his bed, his head shattered, and the instrument of the foul deed within the grasp of the stiffened fingers; picture the stolid jury; the remarks of contemptible pity; the execrations of creditors; and the final interment in some obscure spot of one of the many desolate burial-grounds, or of the crowded cemeteries of London. Yet in what instance could M. Boismont's aspirations concerning self-murder have been more justified? But think of Louis Napoleon, Emperor of the French, and making for himself a colossal name in history, and reflect on the horrible absurdity of suicide as a last political resort. This is no question of Bonapartism or not; for the lesson belongs to every creed of political faith, but it is of the most value to those creeds which are for the nonce depressed, nay apparently hopeless.

Again, sympathy with the motives which may have led to self-murder is one thing, to hold them up as lights for our guidance is another and very different thing. Philip Strozzi dying on the rack, silent amidst his torments, or throwing a noble scorn at his executioners; Philip Strozzi emulating the courage of many christian martyrs and warriors, and not the bastard courage of a Cato, would have



as far excelled the Philip Strozzi dying by his own hand in a dungeon, as Lucifer the angel excelled Lucifer the fallen one. But, alas for the ill example to his supporters!—alas for any cause whose adherents are taught so ready a way to avoid difficulties! his physical courage failed, and Florence lost the example of a martyr, and got the old-fashioned one of a mere conspicuous man. We pity Strozzi, but we should no more hold him up as an example to be followed, than the red Indian would hold out to his son as an example the man who, to avoid torture when a captive, had destroyed himself, or who had suffered a groan to escape him under the torture.

It is recorded that when Charles V. was told of Strozzi's death, and the fashion of it, he remarked *smiling*; "May all my enemies perish thus." It may be surmised that the Emperor shrewdly suspected that Strozzi dying by his own hand would have a less exciting effect upon the Florentines than Strozzi dying by the executioner. The Emperor's opinion of Strozzi and his co-workers, as expressed to Antonio Doria, is not to be overlooked when the question of the patriot's death is noted for admiration. "You little understand these men," said Charles V.; "they do not wish the liberty of their country, but their own greatness; for if we were to remove the duke, they themselves would become lords of Florence, in spite of the citizens, who really love the liberty of the city, but who could not resist the influence, and wealth, and power of these ambitious leaders."

The most transcendental of æsthetical views concerning suicide is that of Elias Regnault, (*Nouvelles Réflexions sur le Suicide*), quoted by M. Dabadie. M. Regnault writes:—

"Suicide is the last term, the highest expression of man's liberty. It is the most energetic protest of the superiority of his nature. Why have not animals ever conceived suicide? Because their nature is every way passive. They have not the choice and the preference. Man, on the contrary, eminently active and free, has been able to push his activity even to the destruction of himself."

The thought is borrowed from Pliny, but it is a pity that it should have been truncated by Regnault. Here is the missing fragment:—"Indeed," says the pagan writer, "this constitutes the great comfort in this imperfect state of man, that even the Deity cannot do

every thing. For he cannot procure death for himself, even if he wished it, which, so numerous are the evils of life, has been granted to man as our chief good." (*Nat. Hist.* b. ii, c. v.)

But Regnault and his co-thinkers have it that suicide is "*la manifestation la plus éclatante de la personnalité humaine*," only when the act is essentially voluntary. Suicide under the influence of anger or mental alienation is exempted from the category, and really if, with these reservations, it were accepted that suicide is the highest expression of man's liberty, it would simply lead to the conclusion that the act of self-murder involves the highest degree of his responsibility, social, moral, or religious.

A more recent apology for suicide than Regnault's, and one much more novel and curious, is that of M. Bourdin. He holds that suicide is suicide only under certain circumstances. He writes :—

"Sacred and profane history furnish us with many examples of men who have exposed themselves seriously and voluntarily to death, without having nevertheless committed suicide. For example, Sargon become blind, buries himself beneath the ruins of a temple which he has overturned. Eleazar suffers himself to be crushed to death by the falling of an elephant which he has killed. Epaminondas, after having asked if his shield is safe, wishes the javelin to be torn from him, although its removal will cause death. Curtius devotes himself to the gods, and casts himself into a gulf to save his country. Regulus returns to Carthage, loving better to meet death than to violate his sworn faith. Christian history is filled with edifying examples of holy women who have preferred to expose their life rather than undergo a shame; (*potius mori quam fadari*). Saint Domnine and her two daughters, Saints Berenice and Prosdoce doomed themselves in order to save their chastity. Saint Pelagie and her mother threw themselves from a roof to evade the violence of the governor of Antioch. (Saint Ambrose, *De Virginibus*, lib. iii.) Saint Ignatius, bishop, wished that the faithful at Rome should not sue for his pardon: *Voluntarius moriar inquit quia mihi utile est mori*. It would be easy to cite a great number of sacrifices as generous, inspired by faith, by political beliefs, or even by tender but exalted sentiments, such as love, friendship, &c. In these different acts are not found the characteristics of suicide; because to expose one's-self to death, to place one's-self even in circumstances which render death inevitable, is not to wish to kill one's-self—is not to act with a formal and exclusive intention of killing one's-self."

This delectable piece of reasoning is somewhat akin to the casu-

tical opinion of Luther's. He was told of a young girl who, to avoid violence offered to her by a nobleman, had cast herself out of a window and was killed. The question was asked, Was she responsible for her death? Luther said, "No; she felt that this step formed her only chance of safety, it being not her life that she sought to save, but her chastity." (*Luther's Table Talk.*)

"If," to continue M. Bourdin's remarks, "suicide does not exist in the conditions that I have named, all the more does it not exist in regard to those tender but passionate souls, who, feeling the emptiness and nothingness of all around them, ardently lay claim to another country. Still less does it exist in the instances of those members of the National Convention, who, as it is said, *have committed suicide to maintain their honor.* This last distinction is not as vain as it may appear to be at the first sight, because the confusion that it destroys has been made by able thinkers who have not sufficiently studied the matter.

"This preliminary explanation was necessary in order to destroy every species of equivocation, and to define exactly the limits within which suicide exists; it was necessary also in order to eliminate from the pathological classifications of suicide those facts which do not belong to them." (*Du Suicide considéré comme Maladie.* Paris, 1849; p. 9.)

When, therefore, as the result of his researches and of "simple inductive ratiocination," M. Bourdin writes, "I say that suicide is always a disease and always an act of mental alienation; I say, consequently that it does not merit either praise or blame," (*op. cit.* p. 9,) we know that he is not using the term suicide in its ordinary sense.

M. Bourdin's conclusion that suicide, in the restricted sense of the word, merits neither praise nor blame, would, however, seem to be the right deduction to attach to a certain *quasi*-scientific theory of suicide, in the most extended sense of that term, which has been declared by Mr. Buckle in his *History of Civilization in England*. He asserts that all the evidence we possess points "to one great conclusion, and can leave no doubt on our minds that suicide is merely the product of the general condition of society, and that the individual felon only carries into effect what is a necessary consequence of preceding circumstances." The reasons adduced for so remarkable a conclusion deserve to be gravely considered. Mr. Buckle writes:—

" Among public and registered crimes, there is none which seems so completely dependent on the individual as suicide. Attempts to murder or to rob may be, and constantly are, successfully resisted ; baffled sometimes by the party attacked, sometimes by the officers of justice. But an attempt to commit suicide is much less liable to interruption. The man who is determined to kill himself is not prevented at the last moment by the struggles of an enemy ; and as he can easily guard against the interference of the civil power, his act becomes, as it were, isolated ; it is cut off from foreign disturbances, and seems more clearly the product of his own volition than any other offence could possibly be. We may also add, that, unlike crimes in general, it is rarely caused by the instigation of confederates ; so that men, not being goaded into it by their companions, are uninfluenced by one great class of external associations, which might hamper what is termed the freedom of their will. It may therefore very naturally be thought impracticable to refer suicide to general principles, or to detect anything like regularity in an offence which is so eccentric, so solitary, so impossible to control by legislation, and which the most vigilant police can do nothing to diminish. There is also another obstacle that impedes our view ; this is, that even the best evidence respecting suicide must always be very imperfect. In cases of drowning, for example, deaths are liable to be returned as suicides which are accidental ; while, on the other hand, some are called accidental which are voluntary. Thus it is that self-murder seems to be not only capricious and uncontrollable, but also very obscure in regard to proof ; so that on all these grounds it might be reasonable to despair of ever tracing it to those general causes by which it is produced."

Are the circumstances and the motives which lead to or determine the act of suicide so exceptional as to present no aspect, even at a slight glance, of regularity of recurrence ? Have the assumed remote and proximate causes of the deed been of so erratic a character, and so seemingly irregular in their manifestation, as to exhibit no indications of uniformity of action ? Have the many physical and psychical troubles which have impelled man to destroy himself played so unimportant a part in the history of society and of races, manifested such marked characteristics of the incidental and not of the general, that any one of the results to which they have given rise should be expected to present a " capricious " stamp ? Is self-murder " so rarely caused by the instigation of confederates ? " Is this the lesson taught by the history of suicides among the Greeks and the

Romans of old, the Japanese, the Hindoos, and the Parisians of our own day? Do experience and history show that the motives which affect the volition, which bring the mind into the state of pleasing to do a thing or not,\* are so different in different people; do they show that the operations of the emotions, and of the thoughts, as well as the action of the motives which influence them, are so eccentric that "what is termed the freedom of the will" is alike and manifestly eccentric? To each and all of these interrogatories all ordinary individuals, we have little doubt, would unhesitatingly answer, no! Why, it seems to us that all *a priori* reasoning hitherto has led to the very reverse of Mr. Buckle's assertion, that it might "very naturally be thought impracticable to refer suicide to general principles, or to detect any thing like regularity in an offence which is so eccentric." That the recurrence of suicide was governed by definite laws, is a belief as clearly implied in the writings of the ancients upon the act, as that the conviction in the existence of these laws has been a principal incentive to frequent research concerning suicide in all its aspects among the moderns.

As to the *impossibility* of controlling self-murder by legislation and a vigilant police, that is a question of fact which Mr. Buckle deals with as if it were a mere matter of opinion, for he contents himself with the bare assertion at some length, and a reference or two which may, perhaps, be quoted legitimately by those who hold the opinion of the *inutility* of the present system of legislation on suicide, but can afford only slight or very problematical grounds for the belief in the impossibility of controlling suicide by any legislation. We shall have to examine this subject at a greater or less length in a subsequent portion of this article, consequently, we shall simply make here the additional remark, that the fullest and most careful account that we are acquainted with of the history and legislation of suicide among different nations, that of Lisle, (*Du Suicide*, Paris, 1856,) shows not only that there is no sufficient foundation for the opinion that legislation, at all times and under all circum-

\*Bailey. *Letters on the Philosophy of the Human Mind.* 2d Series, p. 173.



stances, is inoperative in checking suicide, or that the belief of law-givers that by their enactments they can diminish suicide, is, as Mr. Buckle asserts, "folly", (*Note, p, 24,*) but also that there is good ground for hope that well-considered legislation would prove beneficial in checking or controlling the evil.

Mr. Buckle's preliminary propositions are in the main mere assumptions. But to continue his argument :—

"These being the peculiarities of this singular crime, it is surely an astonishing fact, that all the evidence we possess respecting it points to one great conclusion, and can leave no doubt in our minds that suicide is merely the product of the general condition of society, and that the individual felon only carries into effect what is a necessary consequence of preceding circumstances. In a given state of society, a certain number of persons must put an end to their own life. This is the general law; and the special question as to who shall commit the crime, depends, of course, upon special laws, which, however, in their total action must obey the large social law to which they are all subordinate. And the power of the larger law is so irresistible, that neither the love of life nor the fear of another world can avail anything towards even checking its operation."

Now notwithstanding that Mr. Buckle states that "all the evidence we possess" points to this conclusion, he refers only to four sources of evidence; Dufau's *Traité de Statistique*, Winslow's *Anatomy of Suicide*, Quetelet's *Statistique Morale*, and certain tables in the *Assurance Magazine*. Certainly one can not help admiring the hardihood of fixing so magnificent a conclusion on the confessedly and necessarily slender data contained in these works. Why we assume that Mr. Buckle's references constitute at least the head and front of his "all the evidence we possess" will be seen presently. As indicating the value of these references in relation to Mr. Buckle's conclusion, we may remark that Quetelet seems to constitute his chief statistical authority, and he is spoken of by him as "confessedly the first statistician in Europe," a sentiment which one might suppose would have at least induced Mr. Buckle to respect his opinions. Now Quetelet has expressly defended his researches from the conclusions which Mr. Buckle is desirous of attaching to them. Quetelet has written :—

"That which precedes shows us that man, in general, proceeds with the greatest regularity in all his actions. Whether he marries, begets, kills himself, robs, or murders, he invariably seems to act under the influence of definite causes independent of his free-will.

"We must carefully guard ourselves here, nevertheless, from concluding that this constancy is the result of a desolating fatalism. FOR OURSELVES, WE SEE IN IT BUT THE PROOF OF THE PERMANENCE OF THE MORAL CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH GIVE RISE TO SUICIDES, DURING THE PERIOD WHICH OUR OBSERVATIONS EMBRACE."\*

Again, Mr. Buckle's assertion that "suicide is merely the product of the general condition of society, and that the individual felon only carries into effect what is a *necessary* consequence of preceding circumstances," is much the same kind of proposition as if it were said that the quotient determined the value of the different figures, and the method of working of a sum. "In a given sum," to adopt Mr. Buckle's phraseology, "certain results must follow. This is the general law; and the special question as to what position each figure shall take in the sum depends, of course, upon special laws; which, however, in their total action, must obey the large arithmetical law to which they are all subordinate. And the power of the larger law is so irresistible, that neither the vexations of multiplication, nor the still greater troubles of division, nor the perplexities of rule of three, nor the maddening irritations of vulgar fractions,† can avail anything towards checking its operation."

Thus the different psychical and physical elements, which are usually supposed to concur in forming the general result commonly

\* "*Tout ce qui précède nous montre que l'homme, en général, procède avec la plus grande régularité dans toutes ses actions. Qu'il se marie, qu'il se reproduise, ou qu'il se tue, qu'il attente à la propriété ou à la vie de son semblable, toujours il semble agir sous l'influence de causes déterminées et placées en dehors de son libre arbitre.*

"*Nous nous garderons bien cependant de conclure de là, que cette constance est le résultat d'un fatalisme désolant. Nous n'y voyons, pour nous, que la preuve de la permanence des circonstances morales qui font naître les suicides, pendant la période qu'embrassait nos observations.*" (QUETELET. *Du Système Social et des Lois qui le régissent.* Paris, 1848—p. 327.)

† Multiplication is vexation,  
Division's twice as bad,  
Rule of Three it puzzles me,  
And Fractions make me mad. (*School Song.*)

stances, is inoperative in checking suicide, or that the belief of law-givers that by their enactments they can diminish suicide, is, as Mr. Buckle asserts, "folly", (*Note, p. 24,*) but also that there is good ground for hope that well-considered legislation would prove beneficial in checking or controlling the evil.

Mr. Buckle's preliminary propositions are in the main mere assumptions. But to continue his argument :—

"These being the peculiarities of this singular crime, it is surely an astonishing fact, that all the evidence we possess respecting it points to one great conclusion, and can leave no doubt in our minds that suicide is merely the product of the general condition of society, and that the individual felon only carries into effect what is a necessary consequence of preceding circumstances. In a given state of society, a certain number of persons must put an end to their own life. This is the general law; and the special question as to who shall commit the crime, depends, of course, upon special laws, which, however, in their total action must obey the large social law to which they are all subordinate. And the power of the larger law is so irresistible, that neither the love of life nor the fear of another world can avail anything towards even checking its operation."

Now notwithstanding that Mr. Buckle states that "all the evidence we possess" points to this conclusion, he refers only to four sources of evidence; Dufau's *Traité de Statistique*, Winslow's *Anatomy of Suicide*, Quetelet's *Statistique Morale*, and certain tables in the *Assurance Magazine*. Certainly one can not help admiring the hardihood of fixing so magnificent a conclusion on the confessedly and necessarily slender data contained in these works. Why we assume that Mr. Buckle's references constitute at least the head and front of his "all the evidence we possess" will be seen presently. As indicating the value of these references in relation to Mr. Buckle's conclusion, we may remark that Quetelet seems to constitute his chief statistical authority, and he is spoken of by him as "confessedly the first statistician in Europe," a sentiment which one might suppose would have at least induced Mr. Buckle to respect his opinions. Now Quetelet has expressly defended his researches from the conclusions which Mr. Buckle is desirous of attaching to them. Quetelet has written :—

"That which precedes shows us that man, in general, proceeds with the greatest regularity in all his actions. Whether he marries, begets, kills himself, robs, or murders, he invariably seems to act under the influence of definite causes independent of his free-will.

"We must carefully guard ourselves here, nevertheless, from concluding that this constancy is the result of a desolating fatalism. FOR OURSELVES, WE SEE IN IT BUT THE PROOF OF THE PERMANENCE OF THE MORAL CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH GIVE RISE TO SUICIDES, DURING THE PERIOD WHICH OUR OBSERVATIONS EMBRACE."\*

Again, Mr. Buckle's assertion that "suicide is merely the product of the general condition of society, and that the individual felon only carries into effect what is a *necessary* consequence of preceding circumstances," is much the same kind of proposition as if it were said that the quotient determined the value of the different figures, and the method of working of a sum. "In a given sum," to adopt Mr. Buckle's phraseology, "certain results must follow. This is the general law; and the special question as to what position each figure shall take in the sum depends, of course, upon special laws; which, however, in their total action, must obey the large arithmetical law to which they are all subordinate. And the power of the larger law is so irresistible, that neither the vexations of multiplication, nor the still greater troubles of division, nor the perplexities of rule of three, nor the maddening irritations of vulgar fractions,† can avail anything towards checking its operation."

Thus the different psychical and physical elements, which are usually supposed to concur in forming the general result commonly

\* "*Tout ce qui précède nous montre que l'homme, en général, procède avec la plus grande régularité dans toutes ses actions. Qu'il se marie, qu'il se reproduise, ou qu'il se tue, qu'il attente à la propriété ou à la vie de son semblable, toujours il semble agir sous l'influence de causes déterminées et placées en dehors de son libre arbitre.*

"*Nous nous garderons bien cependant de conclure de là, que cette constance est le résultat d'un fatalisme désolant. Nous n'y voyons, pour nous, que la preuve de la permanence des circonstances morales qui font naître les suicides, pendant la période qu'embrassait nos observations.*" (QUETELET. *Du Système Social et des Lois qui le régissent.* Paris, 1848—p. 327.)

† Multiplication is vexation,

Division's twice as bad,

Rule of Three it puzzles me,

And Fractions make me mad. (*School Song.*)

spoken of as the state or condition of society, are to be regarded as having their value defined, or regulated, or governed by the results to which they have given rise; or the psychical elements are to be looked upon as not being concurrent causes with the physical in bringing about the state of the society, the former elements being products of the latter, which, in some unexplained manner, constitute or engender the general state spoken of; or the said state of society is a something *per se*—an active entity, or anything, or nothing, as the case may be. The first supposition strikes one as the meaning of Mr. Buckle's proposition at the first glance; the second is necessary to explain certain peculiarities of his explanation of that proposition; the third will be found generally useful in reading the introductory chapters of his work, and the continuation of his argument, which proceeds thus:—

“The causes of this remarkable regularity I shall hereafter examine; but the existence of the regularity is familiar to whoever is conversant with moral statistics. In the different countries from which we have returns we find year by year the same proportion of persons putting an end to their own existence; so that, after making an allowance for the impossibility of collecting complete evidence, we are able to predict, within a very small limit of error, the number of voluntary deaths for each ensuing period; supposing, of course, that the social circumstances do not undergo any marked change.”

In fact, suicide is subject to the ordinary laws of causation. Then what are the “social circumstances” spoken of, which are liable to variation? They are not of a moral character, because Mr. Buckle teaches “that the moral actions of men are the product not of their volition but of their antecedents” (p. 29); and that “suicide is merely the product of the general condition of society,” and of “preceding circumstances.” It is evident, therefore, that the term “social circumstances” is not used here by Mr. Buckle in the sense in which it is ordinarily used, and that it is equivalent to the terms “general condition of, and state of society,” “antecedents,” and “preceding circumstances,” as used by him; and that the two former phrases as well as the two latter are used in some peculiar sense. This sense seems to be capable of no other explanation than a something *per*



se—an active entity; and Mr. Buckle, in endeavoring to escape from a metaphysical Scylla has apparently plunged into a profounder Charybdis. But how do Mr. Buckle's assertions, that "in the different countries from which we have returns, we find year by year the *same* proportion putting an end to their own existence," and "that we are able to predict, within a small limit of error, the number of voluntary deaths for the ensuing period; supposing, of course, that the social circumstances do not undergo any *marked* change,"—tally with the facts and his authorities? We have not, unfortunately, Quetelet's *Statistique Morale* by us, but there are certain remarks in his work on Man, freely referred to by Mr. Buckle, which have a direct bearing on this question. In that work, Quetelet bases his observations on the annual variations of suicides, on *five* years' records of suicides in France, *ten* years' in the department of the Seine, and *seven* years' in the canton of Geneva; and he states; "We recognise in all the preceding figures a frightful concordance between the results of the different consecutive years. This regularity in an act which appears so intimately bound to the volition of man, is manifested more strikingly (as will be presently shown,) in all that appertains to crime. Nevertheless, society may be modified in a country, and bring about changes in that which offers, at the first, a remarkable constancy for a short period (*qui offrait d'abord une constance remarquable pour une période de temps peu étendue*). According to Dr. Casper, 62 suicides were committed at Berlin from 1788 to 1797, 128 from 1797 to 1808, and 546 from 1813 to 1822. (*Sur L'Homme*, L. II, c. ii, s. ii.) Quetelet indeed tells us, in effect, that the regularity in the recurrence of suicide, although true for the "*période de temps peu étendue*," to which his data referred, cannot be assumed to be true of any other period, unless there be other and more extended observations, because such a conclusion would be inconsistent with Dr. Casper's researches, and unwarranted by the very brief character of his own researches. And such, if our memory serves us right, is the carefully guarded character of all M. Quetelet's researches concerning the annual recurrence of suicide, a care rendered necessary from the comparatively limited character of the statistics with which he had to deal.

Let us here glance for a moment at the French statistics of suicide, and see how they bear upon Mr. Buckle's assertion of the yearly recurrence of suicides in the same proportion, except when marked changes in society occur. In France the number of suicides in proportion to the population, was in 1836, 1 in 14,207. From this year there was a progressive increase in the number of suicides year by year, with six exceptions (1841-44-45-46-48-49), until 1852, when the number had increased to 1 in 9340 ! (Lisle, *Du Suicide*, p. 22.) This is scarcely compatible with Mr. Buckle's assertion.

But again, Dufau's statistics of suicide refer to France, and are confined to the *ten* years, 1827-37. In the former year the proportion of suicides to population was, according to him, 1 in 20,660 ; in the latter 1 in 14,338 (13,663, Lisle), consequently the French statistics of suicide show a steady increase from 1827 to 1852, and this, with little variation, from year to year. But M. Dufau's returns, considered alone, from the limited period of time to which they refer, although very suggestive, afford but a slight foundation for any general conclusions, and so conscious is he of this truth, that he carefully avoids doing anything else than setting forth the facts told by his figures, and when he points out an interesting relationship which seemingly exists between the prevalence of suicide and the mean age of the population of a district, he immediately adds that "we state this simply as a conjecture. *The investigation relative to suicide has but commenced,*" &c. (*Op. cit.* p. 302.)

If we now take Mr. Buckle's third authority, Dr. Winslow's work, we shall find in the chapter on the statistics of suicide, first, an account of the number of suicides committed in London for a century and a half, the bearing of which on Mr. Buckle's notions we shall have to refer to presently. Then Dr. Winslow quotes the interesting report of a committee of the Statistical Society, on suicides in Westminster, which is preceded by the very proper remark, that "The committee deem it right to premise that caution must be used in drawing too general inferences from these statements, on account of the comparatively small number of cases to which they refer." Next follows an outline of M. Guerry's researches, the value of which will

be best shown by his own words,—“ These first attempts rarely lead then to an immediate application ; they destroy error rather than establish truth, and their utility consists *less in giving rise to theories than in developing the spirit of criticism and research,*” (*et leur utilité consiste moins à élever des théories qu’ à répandre l’esprit de doute et d’examen*). (*Essai sur la Statistique Morale de la France*, p. 69.) Lastly follows an account of M. Prevost’s researches in suicide in the canton of Geneva, for the ten years 1825-34, which, as they show (putting aside the short period of observation,) an annual mean of 13, a minimum of 6 (1825-1826), a maximum of 24, and a difference of 18, with a population increasing at the rate of about 500 a year, can hardly be supposed to aid Mr Buckle’s ideas much.\* Of the value of the statistics of suicide for the metropolis, we shall take Mr. Buckle’s own opinion. After referring (*Note*, p. 27,) to Mr. Jopling’s paper on the subject, in the *Assurance Magazine*, Mr. Buckle adds, “ These are the only complete consecutive returns of London suicides yet published [they extend over five years], those issued by the police being imperfect.”

Now the foregoing is the character of the references of M. Buckle concerning the statistics of suicide, yet he precedes his remarks on suicide and murder with the following sentence respecting the statistical evidence on crimes : “ This evidence has gone on accumulating until it now forms of itself a large body of literature, containing, with the commentaries connected with it, an immense

\*The following is an approximative calculation of the proportion of suicides to population in the canton of Geneva, from 1825-34, according to the data given by M. Prevost. Population, 1822, 51,113 ; 1834, 56,655 :—

*Suicides in 10,000 population.*

1825.....	1.1
1826.....	1.1
1827.....	1.6
1828.....	2.0
1829.....	2.0

*Suicides in 10,000 population.*

1830.....	2.9
1831.....	3.2
1832.....	2.2
1833.....	4.1
1834.....	2.8

In the thirteen years 1838-50, 1853-55, the annual number of suicides in the canton of Geneva ranged from 11 to 20, the average being 15.6. These figures exhibit a much less degree of variation than those for 1825-34, and show clearly the necessity for a long period of observations before any very absolute rules can be laid down respecting the annual recurrence of suicides in a country. (See Dr. Marc d’Espina’s *Essai Analytique et Critique de Statistique Mortuaire Comparé*, —p. 93, et seq.)

array of facts, so carefully compiled, and so well and clearly digested, that more may be learned from it respecting the moral nature of man, than can be gathered from all the accumulated experience of ages." (!) It is certain that the statistics here spoken of are not those made use of by Mr. Buckle in his examination of the question of suicide.

But to continue Mr. Buckle's argument, lest an iota of it should be lost :—

" Even in London, notwithstanding the vicissitudes incidental to the largest and most luxurious capital in the world, we find a regularity greater than could be expected by the most sanguine believer in social laws ; since political excitement, and the misery produced by the dearness of food, are all causes of suicide, and are all constantly varying. Nevertheless, in this vast metropolis, about 240 persons every year make away with themselves ; the annual suicides oscillating, from the pressure of temporary causes, between 266, the highest, and 213, the lowest. In 1846, which was the great year of excitement caused by the railway panic, the suicides in London were 266 ; in 1847 began a slight improvement, and they fell to 256 ; in 1848 they were 247 ; in 1849 they were 213 ; and in 1850 they were 229." (*History of Civilization*,—pp. 24, 27.)

Truly five years constitute a somewhat narrow basis of observation for so important a conclusion in respect to the *annual* variations of suicide in the metropolis ! But letting this pass, we would mention a remarkably interesting fact or two, connected with the moral statistics of the great city, and which have an immediate bearing upon Mr. Buckle's notions of suicide and crime, although not mentioned by him. From 1701 to 1829 the tendency to suicide in London remained nearly stationary, but the tendency to commit murder rapidly decreased during the same period. In the seventeenth century 4.6 murders occurred in every 10,000 deaths from all causes ; in the nineteenth century only 0.5.\*

\**London Bills of Mortality*.—Proportion of deaths from Suicide and Murder in 10,000 Deaths from all causes :

	<i>Suicide.</i>	<i>Murder.</i>
1647 to 1700	8.5	6.5
1701 " 1749	16.2	3.4
1750 " 1799	15.0	2.1
1800 " 1829	18.6	1.7

These results are obtained from the weekly bills of mortality; they are but approximative, but they are quoted and made use of on the authority of Dr. Farr. If then suicide, the product of a general state of society, is to be taken as an index of that state from 1701 to 1829, it would appear that during that period the said state underwent no very manifest change. But murder as well as suicide, indeed crime in general, is said by Mr. Buckle to be "the result, not so much of the vices of the individual offender, as of the state of society into which the individual is thrown."\* Consequently the fixed character of the state of society—"the irresistible larger law"—governing suicide, is entirely inconsistent with the progressive and constant change manifested in the state of society governing and necessitating murder in the same period. If then, "the state of society" is to be regarded as an equivalent term, as used by Mr. Buckle in reference to both murder and suicide, we are reduced to the dilemma of believing that each crime either comports itself in a fashion of its own towards the general law, and modifies in a constant and regular fashion the action of that law, in which case, what becomes of Mr. Buckle's assertion of its irresistible character? or that there is a general state of society peculiar to each crime, governed

\*Mr. Buckle quotes (*Note* p. 37.) in support of this conclusion, Quetelet's statement that "Experience demonstrates conclusively this opinion, which might seem paradoxical at the first sight, that it is society which prepares crime, and that the criminal is but the instrument which executes it." (*Sur l'Homme*, L. IV, c. ii.) But the word "society" is not used by Quetelet and by Mr. Buckle in the same sense. In the sentence preceding that quoted, Quetelet says, that "since the crimes that are annually committed seem to be a necessary result of our social organization, and that the number can diminish only as the causes which lead to them are previously modified, it is for legislators to recognize these causes, and remove them as much as possible." Here social organization is used in the ordinary signification—the moral actions of man being conceived to play a primary part in it; and legislation would (as it does) refer as well to the moral as to the other causes which concur in bringing about a social organization or state of society. But with Mr. Buckle the moral acts of men become entirely subsidiary to the action of "what is called Nature," and they play an ambiguous disturbing effect, not a primary causative effect. Hence his notion of "society" is very different from Quetelet's, and the signification to be attached to that writer's remarks widely varies from that which Mr. Buckle would attach to them, and by the mode in which he quotes them, we regret to say, seems to wish to convey to others. "We must not conclude," writes Quetelet, "from what I have said, that all the actions of man, that all his tendencies, are submitted to fixed laws; and that consequently



by very different laws, and of which crime is the product, in which case the phrase may mean anything or nothing, (as we have already had occasion to remark), as may be most convenient.

The key to Mr. Buckle's specious and inconsequent argument is to be found in the following propositions which precede it :—

"It is evident that, if it can be demonstrated that the bad actions of men vary in *obedience* to the changes in the surrounding society, we shall be obliged to infer that their good actions, which are, as it were, the residue of their bad ones, vary in the same manner; and we shall be forced to the other conclusion, that such variations are the result of large and general causes, which, working upon the aggregate of society [mark the phraseology—causes working upon society, therefore independent of] must produce certain consequences without regard to the volition of those particular men of whom the society is composed.

"Such is the regularity *we expect to find*, if the actions of men are governed by the state of the society in which they occur; *while on the other hand, if we can find no such regularity we may believe that their actions depend on some capricious and personal principle peculiar to each man, as free-will or the like.*" (p. 21.)

That is, Mr. Buckle assumes, *à priori*, that the actions of men, *per se*, are governed by no regular laws, and that they must of necessity, be manifested, in "some capricious" manner, but if it be

I suppose his free-will to be entirely annihilated. In order to remove any misconception in this respect, some explanations will be so much the more necessary, since they will throw light upon the question of free-will, one of the most difficult and most interesting questions that occur in the studies which occupy our attention. If, for example, we consider the tendency to crime in man, we mark first that this tendency depends upon his peculiar organization, his education, the circumstances in which he is placed, as well as his free-will, to which I accord willingly the greatest influence in modifying all his propensities. . . . As to the free-will, very far from causing perturbations in the series of phenomena which occur with this admirable regularity, it prevents them, on the contrary, in this sense, that it restrains the limits within which the variations of our different propensities are manifested. . . . Thus, then, free-will, very far from interposing an obstacle to the regular production of said phenomena, favors it on the contrary. A people formed only of sages would exhibit annually the most constant recurrence of the same facts. This will explain that which seems at first a paradox—that is to say, that *social phenomena, influenced by the free-will of man, proceed from year to year with greater regularity than phenomena purely influenced by material and fortuitous causes.*" (*Du Système Sociale*, pp. 95-97.) Mr. Buckle regards free-will as a metaphysical figment; he conceives this belief to be conclusively supported by statistics; he is evidently not a statistician himself; yet the foregoing are the conclusions of his chief and most highly-lauded statistical authority!

discovered by observation that the said actions *are* governed by regular laws of recurrence, then it would follow that the *cause* of the said laws must be something apart from, and independent of the individual, consistently with the previous assumption of the eccentricity of his special action. And if moreover, it be further discovered that there is a certain correspondence between changes in the state of society, and the recurrence of certain actions of men, those actions must be in *obedience* to (not simply concurrent with) the changes in society. Then murder and suicide being taken by Mr. Buckle, among other human acts, to illustrate his propositions, and finding that murder and suicide are apparently governed by regular laws of recurrence under *given* circumstances of society, he at once concludes, in accordance with the propositions, that the regularity is due to the state of society; thus explaining the facts of correspondence by his previous assumption, and asserting the truth of his assumption by the facts which he seeks to explain by it! Mr. Buckle first begs the principle (the key of his entire method of reasoning) which it is necessary to prove, with this principle thus begged he explains the facts he considers, and then assumes that the facts *thus explained* demonstrate the principle!

And yet it is upon reasoning of this kind that Mr. Buckle seeks to obtain assent to a conclusion which is equivalent to the assertion that suicide is a ghoul-like necessity, against which neither the individual nor the collective efforts of man can avail anything; and wherever Mr. Buckle's reasoning finds acceptance, it may be anticipated that it will lead to an unfortunate indifference to suicide in its social relations. Meriting neither praise nor blame, and uninfluenced by moral restraints, the act must be submitted to as a disagreeable necessity of every-day life, and we must accustom ourselves to it in the best way we can. And how will this be brought about? Shall we rest content to have this revolting creation of a new Frankenstein hunting its victims day by day to death among us in common-place ghastly guise? Surely not. We shall strive to hide the most horrible features beneath a profusion of conceits; we shall fence in the pathways of the demon with a wealth of fanciful sen-

timent, and, it may be, we shall end as many others have done (as we shall have in due time to tell), by enshrining an image of him, and worshipping it. In short, the pseudo-philosophy of Mr. Buckle tends towards the same end—the same unhealthy tone of sentiment concerning suicide which is found to pervade the quotations which we have given from French writers on the subject, and the more intricate workings of which we have still to trace out.

Let us have a care. We have our present artists, who find a charm in suicide; we have an apologist for the act in certainly one of the most facile and attractive historical writers of the day; and the prescriptions of both the law and the gospel in reference to it are, in a great measure, unheeded. This is not a bad starting-point and ground-work in favor of a reactionary movement, sympathetic of suicide; and if we do not take heed, we shall have our young men and maidens looking upon the deed as a matter of feeling and not of morality. And so, in due time, we should come to hear the legitimacy of suicide babbled of at our firesides and in our workshops, while sympathy would find an outlet in song. Would you have an example of the song? Read—

“Up, up, my page! and saddle quick,  
And mount my fleetest steed,  
And over field, and over fell,  
To Duncan's castle speed.

“Lurk in the stable till thou spy  
Some horse-boy of the train,  
Then ask him, which the bride may be  
Of Duncan's daughters twain?

“And should he say, ‘The olive maid,’  
Ride back without delay;  
But should he say, ‘The fair-haired girl,’  
Then linger by the way.

“Then hie thee to the rope-yard, boy,  
And purchase me a cord:  
Ride slowly home, and give it me,  
But do not speak a word.”

The suicide lies at the cross-roads,  
Interr'd at the midnight hour;

And there a blue floweret blossoms—  
The poor sinner's flower.

I stood at the cross-roads sighing;  
'Twas hard on the midnight hour;  
There waved in the moonlight slowly  
The poor sinner's flower.\*

"Give me an ounce of civet, good apothecary,  
To sweeten my imagination."

We have not reached the core of our subject, and yet we are at the end of our space. We hope, however, at another time to pursue our theme.

\*Heinrich Heine's Book of Songs. Translated by John L. Willis. London, 1856.

---

WILLIAM SHAKSPEARE AS A PHYSIOLOGIST, AND PSYCHOLOGIST. BY A. O. KELLOGG, M. D., Port Hope, C. W.

[*Continued from page 148.*]

IF Lear and Macbeth have served to impress us deeply with the extraordinary intuitive, psychological knowledge of Shakspeare, yet even these, as wonderful as they are, and so infinitely above every thing else in ancient or modern dramatic literature, cannot be taken as a guage by which we are to measure the powers of that intellect from whence they emanated; for the exhibition of the complete plenitude of these powers seems to have been reserved for the tragedy of Hamlet, that wonderful play, which of all he has left gives us the most exalted notions of, and the most profound reverence for the genius of the man. Nothing he has left us exhibits so completely the wonderful versatility of his powers, and the universality of their range, as this play. All the deepest subjects, those which individually have engaged the most profound powers of the human mind in

all ages, are here grappled with, and in each the poet has shown himself preëminent. Wit the most sparkling, humor the most genuine, pathos the most touching, metaphysics the most subtle, philosophy the most profound, are here brought together in most complete and harmonious union. Well may such an one be called the "myriad-minded." As might be expected, no one of his plays has given rise to so much speculation, regarding the purposes of the dramatist, and the true character of the personages he has here represented. Some of the most profound critics of the last century, and down to the present time, have here found an enigma which they have by no means been able to solve, and which has been to them a stumbling block and perpetual rock of offence. Schlegel, one of the most profound of German critics, who devoted some of the best years of his poetical life to the study of Shakspeare, and who has poured upon the pages of our great dramatist the light of a most profound and philosophical criticism, and done more perhaps, than any other man to give us a true conception of his character, has not been able to analyze the character of Hamlet with any thing approaching to psychological accuracy. In fact, the idea of Hamlet as a genuine madman, seems never to have entered his mind, and hence his perplexity, and labored and unsuccessful efforts to unravel the mysteries and apparent contradictions he meets at every step, and the extraordinary manifestations of character which he finds in his hero.

"This enigmatical work," says Schlegel, "resembles those irrational equations in which a fraction of unknown magnitude always remains, that will in no way admit of solution. He *acts the part of a madman* with unrivalled powers, convincing the persons sent to examine into his supposed loss of reason, merely by telling them unwelcome truths, and rallying them with the most caustic wit. But in the resolutions he so often embraces and always leaves unexecuted, his weakness is too apparent; he does himself only justice when he implies that there is no greater dissimilarity than between him and Hercules. He is not only impelled by necessity to artifice and dissimulation, but he has a *natural inclination* for crooked ways. He is a hypocrite towards himself; his far-fetched scruples are often mere pretexts to cover his want of determination,—thoughts, as he says on a different occasion, which have 'but one part wisdom, and ever three parts coward.'



"He has been chiefly condemned both for his harshness in repulsing the love of Ophelia, which he himself had cherished, and for his insensibility at her death. He is too much overwhelmed with his own sorrows to have any compassion to spare for others; besides, his outward indifference gives us by no means the measure of his internal perturbation. On the other hand, we evidently perceive in him a malicious joy, when he has succeeded in getting rid of his enemies, more through necessity and accident, which alone are able to impel him to quick and decisive measures, than by the merit of his own courage, as he himself confesses after the murder of Polonius.

"Hamlet has no firm belief either in himself or in any thing else. From expressions of religious confidence he passes over to sceptical doubts—he believes in the ghost of his father as long as he sees it, but as soon as it has disappeared, it appears to him almost in the light of a deception. He has even gone so far as to say there is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so. With him the poet loses himself here in labyrinths of thought in which neither end nor beginning is discoverable. (?)

"A voice from another world, commissioned it would appear by Heaven, demands vengeance for a monstrous enormity, and the demand remains without effect. The criminals are at last punished, but as it were by an accidental blow, and not in the solemn way requisite to convey to the world a warning example of justice. Irresolute foresight, cunning, treachery and impetuous rage, hurry on to a common destruction: the less guilty and the innocent are equally involved in the common ruin. The destiny of humanity is there exhibited as a gigantic sphinx, which threatens to precipitate into the abyss of scepticism all who are unable to solve her dreadful enigmas."

We have brought forward this extract from one of Shakspeare's most able critics, to illustrate how vain are all efforts to solve the "enigma" which the poet has furnished us, and to unlock the profound mystery with which he has surrounded the character of his hero, without the true key, which is at once furnished by the supposition of the *real* madness of Hamlet, which, to the experienced medical psychologist is quite as evident, notwithstanding what he himself says about "putting on an antic disposition," as that of Ophelia or Lear. To the critic, this is the "fraction of unknown magnitude," which so long as it remains, will not allow him to solve his "equation," and until this is known and recognized, we quite agree with him, that "no thinking head who anew expresses himself upon it,

will entirely coincide with his predecessors." Admit the real madness of Hamlet, and it is readily perceived why this "Prince of royal manners," this man of highly cultivated and deeply philosophical mind, this man naturally endowed with the finest sense of propriety, "the glass of fashion and the mould of form," so susceptible of all that is noble in human nature, becomes, in the language of the critic, a "hypocrite towards himself," and possessed by a "natural inclination for crooked ways." With the supposition of real madness, and only with this supposition, can we account to ourselves for the harshness, the insensibility, the heartless cruelty of one who loved with more than the love of "forty thousand brothers," towards the gentle and lovely being who was the cherished idol of his heart.

But, until after taking a view of the peculiar form and character of Hamlet's madness, we forbear farther comment upon the criticism of the learned and philosophical Schlegel, and pass to that of another German still greater than he.

Who is more worthy to be heard than Goethe, the poet and philosopher, the father of "the higher literature of Germany," "which," says Carlyle most truthfully, "is the highest literature of Europe?" Yet even he, with all his profound and philosophical insight, is almost as far as Schlegel from forming a true estimate of the psychological character and mental condition of Hamlet, and the strange bearing and conduct which results from it, as the following eloquent criticism which we translate from his "*Wilhelm Meister*," abundantly proves. Both fail in their estimate of the character of Hamlet, from one and the same cause, as we shall endeavor to show: namely, a want of that medico-psychological knowledge, which none but a Shakspeare is supposed to possess intuitively.

"Imagine to yourself a prince whose father dies unexpectedly. The desire of honor and love of power are not the passions which animate him; it is sufficient for him that he was the son of a king, but now is he under the necessity of observing carefully from a distance, the difference between the king and the subject. The right to the crown was not hereditary, yet a longer life of his father might have made the claim of his only son stronger, and the hope of the crown more secure. Now, on the contrary, he must attain it

through his uncle, and, notwithstanding the apparent promise, perhaps he is forever shut out from it. He now feels himself poor in graces and goods, a stranger in that which, from his youth up, he was accustomed to regard as his own by right. Here his spirit receives the first heavy stroke. He feels that he is no more than, indeed not so much as every nobleman. He regards himself as a servant of all. He is not courteous, not condescending; no, rather bowed down and indigent. Upon his former circumstances he now looks as upon a vanished dream. In vain does his uncle encourage him, and endeavor to show him his situation from another point of view; the perception of his nothingness never leaves him.

"The second stroke he receives wounds him yet more, bows him yet deeper. It is the marriage of his mother. To him, a true and tender son, there remains after his father's death a mother, and he hopes in company with his noble mother left behind, to do honor to the heroic form of the great one departed. But he also loses his mother, and in a manner far worse than though death had torn her from him. The perfect ideal which a well-bred child so readily forms of his parents, vanishes; from the dead there is no help, and from the living no support. She is also a woman, and from the common frailties incident to her sex she is not exempt. Now for the first time he feels himself truly bowed down, and no fortune in the world can again restore unto him that which he has lost. Not melancholy, not naturally reflective, melancholy and reflection become to him heavy burdens. Imagine vividly to yourself this young man, this princely son; figure to yourself his circumstances, and then observe him when he perceives the appearance of his father's form. Stand by him on that terrible night when the venerable spirit himself walks before him. Huge terror and amazement seize upon him. He speaks to the wonderful figure, sees it beckoning, follows, and hears. The terrible complaint resounds in his ears, calling for vengeance, and the pressing and oft-repeated entreaty, 'Remember me.' And when the spirit has vanished, what do we see standing before us? A young hero that pants for vengeance? a born prince that deems himself fortunate in wreaking vengeance upon the usurper of his crown? No; astonishment and sadness fall upon the lone one. He becomes bitter against the smiling villain, and swears not to forget the departed, and concludes with the significant expression, 'The times are out of joint, woe unto me that I was born to set them right.' In these words lies the key to the whole conduct of Hamlet, and to me it is clear that Shakspeare would have pictured a great deed imposed as a duty upon a spirit that was not equal to that deed. This idea seems worked out in the entire plot. Here is an oak planted in a delicate vessel that should only have contained flowers; the roots strike out, and the vessel is destroyed.

"A beautiful, high, noble, pure, moral being, without the mental

strength which makes the hero, travels under a burden which crushes him to the earth—one which he can neither bear nor cast entirely from him. Every duty is sacred to him, but this is too heavy. The impossible was demanded of him; not that which was in itself impossible, but that which was impossible unto him. How he writhes and turns, filled with anguish, strides backwards and forwards, ever being reminded, ever reminding himself, and at last losing sight of his purpose without ever having been made happy."

Here evidently are causes sufficient to induce insanity in minds far less susceptible to the invasion of the malady than that of Hamlet, and simply because, early in the progress of the disease, he speaks of "putting on an autic disposition," we are not to suppose, in face of all the evidence which follows, that we have to deal with a case of feigned insanity, and that the poet has, in producing the counterfeit, done more than he intended, and made the stamp so perfect, that he has been able to "deceive the very elect" themselves. Upon other occasions, where the evidence of the poet's intentions was quite palpable to all, and where he most certainly intended to produce a counterfeit, he has succeeded, as in everything he undertakes, and we have truly a counterfeit, such as needs no "expert" to detect.

Shakspeare, in the plenitude of his knowledge—a knowledge derived not from books and the accumulated experience of others, but from the closest observation of what he must have seen in actual life,—recognized what none of his critics not conversant with medical psychology in its present advanced state, seem to have any conception of; namely, that there are cases of melancholic madness, of a delicate shade, in which the reasoning faculties, the intellect proper, so far from being overcome or even disordered, may, on the other hand, be rendered more active and vigorous, while the will, the moral feelings, the sentiments and affections, are the faculties which seem alone to suffer from the stroke of disease. Such a case he has given us in the character of Hamlet, with a fidelity to nature which continues more and more to excite our wonder and astonishment, as our knowledge of this intricate subject advances.

Within the last few years our knowledge of the various shades of insanity has been so much advanced, that what we conceived to be the true view of the character of Hamlet appears now to be well



established, and whether Shakspeare himself was conscious of what he was producing, matters little; the delineation is so true to nature that those who are at all acquainted with the intricate disease are fully convinced that Hamlet represents faithfully a phase of genuine madness.\* Whatever may have been the intention of Shakspeare, one thing is evident, he has succeeded in exhibiting in the character of Hamlet a most complete revolution of all the faculties of the soul, by the overwhelming influence of the intense emotions excited in it, and whether the resulting condition of the mind be one of health or disease, sanity or insanity, (and the line of demarkation is by no means accurately defined,) the phenomena exhibited are, psychologically considered, of the most profound interest. We feel convinced that the change wrought is so great, that the resulting condition of mind must, in the present state of our medico-psychological knowledge, be regarded as of a pathological character, and that Hamlet, with Lear and Ophelia, must be admitted into the ranks of that "noble army of martyrs" to a mind diseased, too many of whom, alas! are found in the walks of every-day life. But we must by no means forget that the term "mind diseased," does not necessarily imply a mind destroyed, or even a mind deranged in all its faculties, but one changed in its normal operations; a change which sometimes consists in a preternatural operation or excessive activity of some of its nobler faculties, while others are more or less paralyzed. Such a change Shakspeare has exhibited in a most masterly manner in the character and conduct of Hamlet, as shown throughout this most extraordinary play, and which change, we shall now proceed to

\* The late Dr. Brigham, who had seen and treated more than four thousand cases of insanity, declared that he had more than once seen the counterpart of Hamlet, as well as of all Shakspeare's insane characters, and describes with his usual clearness and brevity the peculiar characteristics of each. Dr. Isaac Ray, the accomplished Superintendent of the Butler Hospital, in a most able, elegant and classical essay on "Shakspeare's delineations of Insanity" (see *Journal of Insanity*, vol. iii.), a paper which we could hold up with no small amount of national pride to our professional brethren of other countries, as an example of American medical literature, also takes this view of the character of Hamlet, and in our estimation has set forever at rest this vexed question of his real or assumed madness, and solved satisfactorily that enigma which Schlegel refers to, and which has so long vexed and discomfited all Shakspeare's non-medical critics.



trace, and attempt to analyze the mental and moral phenomena exhibited in the course of it.

Upon our first introduction to Hamlet, (Act I, Scene II,) the idea we form of his character is quite at variance with the view which Schlegel has, that the hero is a hypocrite towards himself, and naturally inclined towards crooked ways, and more in accordance with that entertained by Goethe, who, as we have seen, regards him as a prince of a most noble, pure, affectionate and highly moral nature. His keen penetration pierces the mask of hypocrisy and lying deceit assumed by the king, his "uncle-father," and the first expression we have from his lips, evinces his utter contempt and detestation of it. When he first addresses him with mock tenderness as "cousin" and "son," he turns aside and gives utterance to the caustic sarcasm,—

"A little more than kin, and less than kind."

He also perceives with keen anguish of spirit, the heartlessness of his "aunt-mother," and when she reminds him that death is "common,"—

"That all that live must die,  
Passing through nature to eternity—"

he replies significantly: "Yes, madam, 'tis common,"—and when she presses him to know why it "seems" so particular to him, he hints directly at his own real woe, as contrasted with those outward, hypocritical expressions of sorrow which surround him, in what follows:—

"Seems, madam! nay it is; I know not seems.  
'Tis not alone my inky cloak, good mother,  
Nor customary suits of solemn black,  
Nor windy suspiration of forced breath,  
No, nor the fruitful river in the eye,  
Nor the dejected 'havior of the visage,  
Together with all forms, moods, shows of grief,  
That can denote me truly. These, indeed, seem,  
For they are actions that a man might play;  
But I have that within which passeth show;  
These but the trappings and the suits of woe."

This is certainly not the language of one who is a "hypocrite towards himself," or one who has a natural inclination to, or love for

hypocrisy and crooked ways, or delights to recognize those traits of character in others; whatever we may afterwards observe in him, as the result of disease.

The keen arrow of affliction first pierces his soul when death suddenly and unexpectedly takes away his kingly father. Time, however, would have healed this wound, but it is torn open and made to bleed afresh by the sudden and too precipitate marriage of his mother with his uncle. His keen moral nature cannot but regard this union as incestuous, and the disgrace reflected upon himself buries the arrow yet deeper, and its rankling is perceptible in the language he utters immediately after the interview with the king and queen, glanced at above. The disgrace of this hasty and incestuous union, reflected as we have said upon himself, seems to cause him to despise even his own flesh and blood, and engenders in him the wish to be free from its encumbrance:—

“O that this too, too solid flesh would melt,  
Thaw, and resolve itself into a dew!”

Dark thoughts of self-destruction enter his mind, yet his high moral nature, as yet untainted by disease, appears to revolt from suicide as a sin against God and nature, and in the deep anguish of his soul, he continues,—

“Or that the Everlasting had not fixed  
His canon 'gainst self-slaughter.”

Then, very naturally, he seeks to shift the sore burden of his afflictions over to the general account of the world and humanity:—

“O God! O God!  
How weary, stale, flat and unprofitable  
Seem to me all the uses of this world!  
Fye on't! O fye! 'tis an unweeded garden  
That grows to seed, things rank and gross in nature  
Possess it merely.”

Let us now follow him, bearing his sore burden of affliction, into the scene which follows between him, his friend Horatio, and the officers of the watch. A new excitement is here prepared to stir up his already overburdened mind, and the extraordinary revelations

made by them respecting the apparition they had seen, excite in him the most painful curiosity, and his mind appears to become giddy with the intense excitement, without at all losing its balance. After interrogating them keenly and closely in the exciting dialogue as to the appearance and manner of what they had seen, he says, evidently under the most intense excitement of mind :—

“ If it assume my noble father’s person,  
I’ll speak to it, though hell itself should gape,  
And bid me hold my peace. \* \* \*  
My father’s spirit in arms! All is not well;  
I doubt some foul play: ’would the night were come!  
Till then sit still, my soul.”

Let us now stand by and observe him in the struggles of that terrible night he here longs for, and then endeavor to estimate the effect upon his mind and feelings, of the startling disclosures made by the ghost of his father, and which constitute apparently the crowning excitement under which a will, hitherto intact, and a strength of character which has hitherto sustained him in all his severe trials, and the highest and strongest manifestations of which we here perceive, appear to give way under the burden now imposed upon them, rendering all his subsequent struggles impotent and vain. As this extraordinary scene appears to constitute the turning point in his mental and moral career, and serves more than any other to mould the subsequent character of his mind and feelings, we deem no excuse necessary for dwelling at some length upon it, and bringing forward what appears necessary to illustrate our position.

The scene opens by furnishing us another illustration of that native, high-toned moral feeling, which is so characteristic of him, and so much at variance with that by which he is, and ever has been surrounded. His reply to the interrogatory of Horatio, who inquires the meaning of the noise which celebrates the bacchanalian revels of the court, asking if it is a “ custom,” is peculiarly graceful and characteristic of the man :—

“ Ay, marry is’t;  
And to my mind, though I am native here  
And to the manner born, it is a custom  
More honoured in the breach than the observance.”

And here follow some pertinent remarks upon the influence of these things upon individual and national character, which remarks are interrupted by the entrance of the ghost. When he first perceives the approach of the wonderful figure, huge terror and amazement naturally seize upon him, and after recovering himself, he addresses it in language, the terrible grandeur of which never has been equaled.

"Angels and ministers of grace, defend us!  
 Be thou a spirit of health, or goblin dammed,  
 Bring with thee airs from heaven, or blasts from hell,  
 Be thine intents wicked, or charitable,  
 Thou com'st in such a questionable shape,  
 That I will speak to thee. I'll call thee, Hamlet,  
 King, father, royal Dane. O, answer me.  
 Let me not burst in ignorance! but tell  
 Why thy canonized bones, hearsed in death,  
 Have burst these cerements! Why the sepulchre,  
 Wherein we saw the quietly inurned,  
 Hath op'd his ponderous and marble jaws,  
 To cast thee up again! What may this mean,  
 That thou, dead corse, again, in complete steel,  
 Revisit'st thus the glimpses of the moon,  
 Making night hideous; and we fools of nature,  
 So horridly to shake our disposition,  
 With thoughts beyond the reaches of our souls?  
 Say, why is this? wherefore? what should we do?"

He sees the ghost beckoning him to a distance, and while his companions are quaking with terror, he seems to know no fear; expresses his contempt for life; declares it cannot hurt his soul, "being a thing as immortal as itself;" and feeling—

"Each petty artery in this body  
 As hardy as the Nemean lion's nerve,"

tears himself from his companions, who hold him back lest he may meet with some terrible fate, or be driven to madness; threatens to make a ghost of them if they do not "unhand" him; follows and hears. After a few exclamations of pity, surprise and horror at what is announced, after expressing his determination to sweep to his revenge on —

"Wings swift as meditation, or the thoughts of love,"

made by them respecting the apparition they had seen, excite in him the most painful curiosity, and his mind appears to become giddy with the intense excitement, without at all losing its balance. After interrogating them keenly and closely in the exciting dialogue as to the appearance and manner of what they had seen, he says, evidently under the most intense excitement of mind :—

“If it assume my noble father’s person,  
I’ll speak to it, though hell itself should gape,  
And bid me hold my peace. \* \* \*  
My father’s spirit in arms! All is not well;  
I doubt some foul play: ’would the night were come!  
Till then sit still, my soul.”

Let us now stand by and observe him in the struggles of that terrible night he here longs for, and then endeavor to estimate the effect upon his mind and feelings, of the startling disclosures made by the ghost of his father, and which constitute apparently the crowning excitement under which a will, hitherto intact, and a strength of character which has hitherto sustained him in all his severe trials, and the highest and strongest manifestations of which we here perceive, appear to give way under the burden now imposed upon them, rendering all his subsequent struggles impotent and vain. As this extraordinary scene appears to constitute the turning point in his mental and moral career, and serves more than any other to mould the subsequent character of his mind and feelings, we deem no excuse necessary for dwelling at some length upon it, and bringing forward what appears necessary to illustrate our position.

The scene opens by furnishing us another illustration of that native, high-toned moral feeling, which is so characteristic of him, and so much at variance with that by which he is, and ever has been surrounded. His reply to the interrogatory of Horatio, who inquires the meaning of the noise which celebrates the bacchanalian revels of the court, asking if it is a “custom,” is peculiarly graceful and characteristic of the man :—

“Ay, marry is’t;  
And to my mind, though I am native here  
And to the manner born, it is a custom  
More honoured in the breach than the observance.”



And here follow some pertinent remarks upon the influence of these things upon individual and national character, which remarks are interrupted by the entrance of the ghost. When he first perceives the approach of the wonderful figure, huge terror and amazement naturally seize upon him, and after recovering himself, he addresses it in language, the terrible grandeur of which never has been equaled.

"Angels and ministers of grace, defend us!  
Be thou a spirit of health, or goblin dammed,  
Bring with thee airs from heaven, or blasts from hell,  
Be thine intents wicked, or charitable,  
Thou com'st in such a questionable shape,  
That I will speak to thee. I'll call thee, Hamlet,  
King, father, royal Dane. O, answer me.  
Let me not burst in ignorance! but tell  
Why thy canonized bones, hearsed in death,  
Have burst these cerements! Why the sepulchre,  
Wherein we saw the quietly inurned,  
Hath op'd his ponderous and marble jaws,  
To cast thee up again! What may this mean,  
That thou, dead corse, again, in complete steel,  
Revisit'st thus the glimpses of the moon,  
Making night hideous; and we fools of nature,  
So horridly to shake our disposition,  
With thoughts beyond the reaches of our souls?  
Say, why is this? wherefore? what should we do?"

He sees the ghost beckoning him to a distance, and while his companions are quaking with terror, he seems to know no fear; expresses his contempt for life; declares it cannot hurt his soul, "being a thing as immortal as itself;" and feeling—

"Each petty artery in this body  
As hardy as the Nemean lion's nerve,"

tears himself from his companions, who hold him back lest he may meet with some terrible fate, or be driven to madness; threatens to make a ghost of them if they do not "unhand" him; follows and hears. After a few exclamations of pity, surprise and horror at what is announced, after expressing his determination to sweep to his revenge on —

"Wings swift as meditation, or the thoughts of love,"

he listens with dumb astonishment to the awful revelations of crime which the ghost pours into his ears. After the appearance vanishes, the first words he utters give the clew to his mental and physical state, and it is quite evident that the cord which has been stretched to its utmost tension, here snaps suddenly, and the consequences are immediately apparent, and are evinced throughout his whole subsequent career. Here enters the pathological element into his mind and disposition, and the working of the leaven of disease is soon apparent, for it changes completely and forever his whole character. Up to this time we see no weakness, no vacillation, no want of energy, no infirmity of purpose. After this, all these characteristics are irrecoverably lost, and though some faculties of his great spirit seem comparatively untouched, others, as we shall see, are completely paralyzed. His first exclamation, as we have said, seems to foreshadow this :—

“O all you host of heaven! O earth! What else?  
And shall I couple hell?—O fie!—Hold, my heart;  
And you, my sinews, grow not instant old,  
But bear me stiffly up!—Remember thee?  
Ay, thou poor ghost, while memory holds a seat  
In this distracted globe.”

Yet immediately after making the discovery which has so much agitated him, that his mother is a “most pernicious and perfidious woman,” and his uncle a “villain, smiling, damned villain,” he takes out his tables as though it were necessary to make a memorandum, lest he forget that, “in Denmark at least, one may smile, and smile, and be a villain.”

What follows in the scene when he returns to his friends, evinces strongly the effect upon his mind of the volcanic upheaving and commotion it has experienced in the interview with the ghost, and savors strongly of disease. Instead of clasping his old friends to his bosom, and seeking from them that sympathy, support and consolation he had a right to expect from them, and which they, though animated with the most intense curiosity and excitement, seem ready to give, he tells each to go about his own especial business, offers them a parting hand, and as for himself, he says,—

"Look you, I'll go pray."

Well does his friend Horatio exclaim,—

"These are but wild and whirling words, my lord."

His manner of speaking to the ghost, whom he hears below when he is swearing his friends to secrecy, so different from the tone of awe and reverential respect he had previously adopted, is very significant, and seems to indicate something more than a healthy reaction from intense excitement. "It betrays," says Dr. Ray, "the excitement of delirium, the wandering of a mind reeling under the first strokes of disease."

When he first hears the word "swear" pronounced by the ghost from below, he exclaims, in language which appears to indicate something more than mock levity :—

"Ha, ha, boy! say'st thou so? art thou there true-penny?  
Come on,—you hear this fellow in the cellarage,—  
Consent to swear."

When he hears the word "swear" pronounced a second time from below, he says :—

"*Hic et ubique!* then we'll shift our ground."

A third time the word is pronounced, and he exclaims :—

"Well said, old mole! can'st work i' the ground so fast?  
A worthy pioneer!"

A fourth time he hears it, and assuming the language of command, he exclaims,—

"Rest, Rest, perturbed spirit!"

The intimation that he conveys in this scene that he may think it "meet to put an antic disposition on," and upon which the theory of feigned madness is mainly built, is quite natural, and quite as consistent with the theory of real as feigned madness, and may, in the commotion of his mind, have resulted as much from a vague consciousness of what was impending, as from any intention to act a part. This is quite clear to the "expert," though he may not succeed in making it so to those critics who take an opposite view of it, and who, having no practical knowledge of the more delicate shades

of mental disease, quite mistake the character of Hamlet, regarding it, like Schlegel, as a riddle not easily solved, or like Goethe, as an illustration of natural imbecility of will and purpose, as we have seen, or perhaps, what is worse, can only see with Dr. Johnson in the "pretended madness" of Hamlet, a cause of much mirth.

The next knowledge we have of Hamlet, comes to us through Ophelia and her father Polonius, and it is evident that in the interval his already shattered mind and crushed feelings have received another sad blow. The gentle and lovely being whom in the ardor of his nature he had loved with more than the love of "forty thousand brothers," prompted by parental duty, and in obedience to the express will of her father, does violence to her own deep, cherished feelings, and repels his letters, and denies him all access to her. The burden of his former sorrows it would seem was sufficiently heavy, but this is greater than all, and what results is just what we might expect, and nothing else, and to suppose with most of Shakspeare's critics, that this is a piece of consummate acting—a drama so admirably played as to deceive her who was accustomed to read the inmost thoughts of his heart—seems to border upon the absurd. Besides, we can perceive no adequate motive for such extraordinary conduct, even were he acting a part, and not really frantic. Had he wished to break the connection as incompatible with the heavy duty imposed upon him, he certainly would not have resorted to such measures in the first instance—such an act would have been too revolting to his nature, and his conduct as well as his personal appearance in her presence, as delineated by herself, is very indicative of the true state of his mind and feelings.

His mind, as we have seen, had been made to reel and stagger by the contending emotions excited by the former scene, but it has not been at any time so completely overthrown as to deprive him, even temporarily, of self-control, until it experiences the shock imparted to it by her refusal to see him, or receive his letters. This, however, together with what has preceded, is more than it can bear, and he becomes for the time being quite frantic. He rushes unbidden into her presence, quite regardless of his personal appearance,—

" With his doublet all unbraced;  
 No hat upon his head, his stockings fouled,  
 Ungartered, and down-gyved to his ankle;  
 Pale as his shirt; his knees knocking each other;  
 And with a look so piteous in purport,  
 As if he had been loosed out of hell,  
 To speak of horrors."

When there, so great are the overwhelming emotions of his soul that the power of utterance is denied him. Feelings which no words can express rend his bosom. "Thoughts which are too deep for tears," rush like a whirlwind through his already shattered mind, and he can only seize her by the wrist, look earnestly and wildly into that face which was wont to beam upon him with the light of love and the most tender feminine affection, as though he would there read the mystery of her conduct, and the change which had come over her, prompting it. Then heaving a sigh,—

" A sigh so piteous and profound,  
 That it did seem to shatter all his bulk,  
 And end his being"—

he retreats as unconsciously as he had entered, his eyes to the last fixed upon that countenance in which he had striven to read the inmost thoughts of her soul. Ophelia could not, and as it is quite evident, *did not* mistake the import of all this, and if we are to regard it as a well-acted *sham*, then let us forever cease to draw a distinction between art and nature; the two are identical, one and the same.

In Hamlet's first interview with Polonius, (Act II, Scene II,) though now quite calm and collected, the evidence of disease is abundantly manifest, as also the keen penetration and capability of discerning the motives of others, so characteristic of certain forms of madness. From the contempt he shows for him, and the keen irony he heaps upon him, and also from the way he alludes to his daughter, it is quite evident that the old courtier is, in his estimation, the cause of the altered conduct of Ophelia, and her refusal, as formerly, to countenance his advances. Either instinctively or by positive information, he seems well aware of what has taken place between him



and his daughter in a former scene. He appears to regard him, as all lovers, sane or insane, are apt to regard a fond and perhaps too judicious parent, who stands between them and their cherished idol, as a meddling old fool, over anxious as to consequences, and quite incapable of appreciating their motives and feelings. In this view of the case, the keen wit and irony he pours out upon the old courtier is most amusing. When the old man asks if he knows him, he replies :—

*Ham.* "Excellent well ; you are a fishmonger.

*Pol.* "Not I, my lord.

*Ham.* "I would you were so honest a man. \* \* \*

To be honest as the world goes, is to be one man picked out of two thousand.

*Pol.* "That's very true, my lord.

*Ham.* "For if the sun breed maggots in a dead dog, being a good, kissing carrion,—Have you a daughter ?

*Pol.* "I have, my lord.

*Ham.* "Let her not walk i' the sun. Conception is a blessing ; but not as your daughter may conceive—friend look to't."

He seems to take a morbid delight in annoying the old man Polonius. Nothing is more natural than for the insane to fix upon some one individual, from whom they have, or imagine they have, received some slight or injury, and endeavor to tease them by every means their insane ingenuity can devise. After pouring out his satirical spite upon old men in general, and Polonius in particular, he thanks him for leaving his presence, telling him that he could take away nothing that would please him better, "except my life, my life."

He meets his old friends Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, cordially, and a lively dialogue ensues, brought about apparently by old associations ; yet in a moment this becomes tinged with the prevailing melancholy of his mind, and the hue of his misanthropic feelings. He scouts the idea that the world is getting honest, calls Denmark a prison, and when they hint that is a prison to him, because too narrow for his ambitious views, he utters a remark quite significant of what is hanging over his mind :—

"O God ! I could be bounded in a nutshell, and count myself a king of infinite space ; were it not that I have had bad dreams."

Restlessness, imperfect sleep, and dreaming are peculiarly incident to the initiatory stages of most forms of mental disease, and this remark forms another link in the chain of evidence respecting the real state of his mind. He interrupts the short metaphysical disquisition on ambition which follows, with a remark which shows that he feels that his mind is not in a fit state to reason on certain things, and can only act as it is directed by the disturbed current of his feelings. "By my fay, I cannot reason," says he, yet in the direction these lead, see how he can discourse:—

"I have of late, (but wherefore, I know not,) lost all my mirth, foregone all custom of exercises: and indeed, it goes so heavily with my disposition, that this goodly frame, the earth, seems to me a sterile promontory; this most excellent canopy, the air, look you,—this brave o'erhanging,—this majestic roof fretted with golden fire, why, it appeareth nothing to me than a foul and pestilent congregation of vapors."

Then follows his famous and well-known apostrophe to man, and many no doubt will think these are hardly the thoughts to emanate from a mind at all tinctured with insanity, but such have yet to learn that the peculiar form of madness delineated by Shakspeare in the character of Hamlet, is quite compatible with occasional outbursts of grand, poetic inspiration. Such will no doubt persist in believing him when he says, "I am but mad, north-north-west; when the wind is southerly, I know a hawk from a handsaw." Those, however, who are familiar with the halls of an asylum for the insane, and have repeatedly heard patients scout the idea of their insanity in language almost identical with the above, will continue to persist in holding a contrary opinion.

At the conclusion of Act II, he furnishes us with the clearest evidence yet given of that paralyzed will, the first signs of which we began to perceive shortly after his interview with the ghost. Here we find him deploring his weakness, quite conscious of his utter inability to sweep to that revenge he had so solemnly sworn to execute. As keenly conscious as ever of the great wrong done him by his uncle, the only power left him is the power to rail against him, "to fall a cursing like a very drab, a scullion," and this he does

with a hearty good will, a "science," so to speak, only thoroughly understood, it has often seemed to us, by the insane themselves. Hear him rail at himself for his infirmity of will and purpose:—

Who calls me villain? breaks my pate across?

Plucks off my beard and blows it in my face?

Tweaks me by the nose? gives me the lie i' the throat?

As deep as to the lungs? Who does me this?

Ha!

Why, I should take it; for it cannot be,

But I am pigeon-livered, and lack gall

To make transgression bitter; or, ere this,

I should have fatted all the region kites

With this slave's offal. Bloody, bawdy villain!

Remorseless, treacherous, lecherous, kindless villain!

O, vengeance! \* \* \* \*

Eye upon't! foh! About, my brain!"

How different is all this from the language used in the scene with the ghost, and from that lion-heartedness with which he breaks from his friends and follows it. And what a change does it indicate, wrought by disease in the character of the man. He then, as a mere pretext and excuse for his want of energy, pretends to doubt if even the ghost was an honest ghost, suggests that it might have been the very devil himself, seeking to assail him through his "weakness" and "melancholy," in order to damn him; and in the true spirit of his disease devises a scheme to test the matter by means of the play. The successive steps in the progress of his disease now become more and more marked, and we next perceive an upheaving and overthrow of those deep moral feelings and affections, so peculiar to his character before the invasion of the disease. And here let those who maintain the theory of feigned madness be careful to observe, that the very feelings and faculties of his soul which have been most intensely exercised, are the very ones which first give way and become most completely upset by the diseased reaction which follows. This they may regard, if they choose, as a mere coincidence; it will, however, be somewhat difficult for them to show that it was more easy, natural and convenient for Hamlet to assume this form of madness

than a form more readily calculated to deceive others,—one more easily feigned to carry out his purpose of deception. To us it appears, that Shakspeare has, as usual, “held the mirror up to nature,” in making his faculties become diseased in the very direction in which they have been most intensely exercised; whether that direction be as he says, “north-north-west,” or towards some other point of the intellectual compass.

His will, courage and energy of purpose, had been put to the utmost test in the interview with the ghost, and the result we have seen. Let us now see what has been the consequences of excessive exercise of the moral feelings and affections of his ardent nature. In illustration of this, let us glance for a moment at his remarkable interview with Ophelia, in Act III, Scene I, of the play. From what we have observed in former scenes, it is abundantly evident that Hamlet had loved the gentle Ophelia with all the intensity his ardent and affectionate nature was capable of, and which love, it is also evident, had been abundantly reciprocated. The first blow to this comes through her, prompted by her father, and it falls upon him when his mind is sadly unprepared to receive it. Writhing as he was under his other sorrows and their diseased reaction, as we shall see in this scene, it falls upon her with a weight so crushing, that all our sympathies are enlisted for the gentle being, and these are made more lively by the remembrance that she has not called down all this upon herself by her fickleness and feminine caprice, but that it has been instigated by parental duty. In the midst of that grand soliloquy, in which, prompted by the melancholy of his mind and the dark misanthropy of his feelings, he places so insignificant an estimate upon human life when weighed in the balance against the cares, perplexities and sorrows incident to it, and where, quite forgetting the axiom he has previously advanced, that “there is nothing good or bad but thinking makes it,” he spurns it, and casts a fearful glance towards the mysteries of the grave and eternity, also tinged with the dark hue of his thoughts, and in which he thinks “perchance” there may be “dreams” more terrible than the sad realities which now surround him,—he is interrupted by the entrance of Ophelia. The

first sight of her appears to awaken in him all those tender emotions he was accustomed in health to indulge towards her :—

“Soft you, now!

The fair Ophelia :—Nymph, in thy orisons,  
Be all my sins remembered.”

To her first greeting he replies thoughtfully and respectfully, and if not affectionately and cordially, in a manner suited to the state of mind in which she has found him. She then takes occasion to restore him the gifts he has made her, intimating that he had ceased to love her. In an instant the demon of disease slumbering in his mind is roused up and let loose upon her, to lacerate most unmercifully her already crushed and bleeding heart, and he does his work with that refined cruelty which only such a demon is capable of. She attempts to reason with the monster, and as was to be expected from its true nature, it only becomes more and more cruel, and ceases not to rend her till its mad rage is expended, and she stands before us trembling in every limb, her heart bleeding from many deep and sore wounds, “like Niobe, all tears,” an object of the deepest commiseration.

Those who can perceive in all this nothing more than a well-acted sham, in which the actor does violence to his own best feelings, and wounds and lacerates fearfully those of her whom he had loved so tenderly, for purposes of deception—when all this was quite unnecessary for carrying out that deception he is supposed to attempt—should for ever after cease to look for any thing like dramatic propriety in the works of the great bard. Ophelia, certainly no incompetent judge under the circumstances, seems as before to have placed the proper estimate upon his conduct. The lynx-eyed vigilance of woman's love could not be deceived, and she has read correctly the riddle which has so perplexed all Shakspeare's critics down to the present time. When he leaves her presence after this harrowing scene, with the cutting words, “Get thee to a nunnery,” upon his lips, she says :—

“O what a noble mind is here o'erthrown!

The courtier's, soldier's, scholar's, eye, tongue, sword:



The expectancy and rose of the fair state,  
 The glass of fashion, and the mould of form,  
 The observed of all observers, quite, quite down!  
 And I of ladies most deject and wretched,  
 That sucked the honey of his music vows,  
 Now see that noble and most sovereign reason,  
 Like sweet bells jangled out of tune and harsh;  
 That unmatched form and feature of blown youth,  
 Blasted with ecstasy: O, woe is me!  
 To have seen what I have seen, see what I see!

In the first part of Scene II, (Act III,) in giving his instructions to the players, and also his ideas as to what should be the true character of theatrical performances, he is quite calm and collected, his mind and feelings apparently undisturbed, and to have met him now no one would have supposed him either insane or feigning. This is quite natural and consistent with the form of madness under which he suffers, "a form," says Dr. Brigham, "under which the mind only occasionally suffers, while the feelings are greatly disordered by disease." Strangers to insanity on passing for the first time through the halls of an asylum which are devoted to the better classes of patients, are frequently much surprised at the rational conversation, apt remarks, and gentlemanly bearing and conduct of some, and can scarcely believe them insane, and often, as we have frequently seen, manifest much curiosity in questioning the medical officers in charge as to how the disease which they are unable to perceive, manifests itself. Farther on in the scene, when the court enters to witness the play, he is quite calm, as though he had braced up his mind and curbed his feelings to observe carefully its effect upon the king and queen. Yet even here, there is a kind of childishness, a juvenility of mind manifested, which is quite unlike the real Hamlet of Act I, or the insane Hamlet of Act II. The demon within is now slumbering, and towards the gentle being it has so lately lacerated he is quite changed, throws himself down at her feet, and like a little child asks to be permitted to lay his head in her lap. Such are the varied phases of madness, and how wonderful is that power of observation in our great dramatist, which has enabled him to draw them so

minutely and accurately. His knowledge of the human heart and mind, under all circumstances and in all forms, whether of health or disease, was so accurate that he never makes a mistake, and when he appears to us should strongly suspect that we do not understand him, and wait humbly and labor patiently for a more accurate knowledge of his purposes and intentions. Throughout this entire scene, even after the developments brought about by the effect of the play upon the king, there is a peculiar levity in his manner and conduct which savors strongly of mental and moral unsoundness, and we are quite ready to believe him when he says to Guildenstern: "I cannot make you a wholesome answer, my wit's diseased."

The next appearance of Hamlet, of importance in illustration of our position, is at the conclusion of Scene III, where he finds the king alone and at his attempted devotions. Here was an excellent opportunity for him to wreak his vengeance upon him, and he saw it. "Now might I do it pat," says he; but he does not, for the impulse under which alone he can act efficiently is not upon him, and his diseased will and infirmity of purpose are not sufficient for it, and framing a flimsy excuse, such as the fear that if he sent him into eternity while praying he would not be damned, and his revenge would be incomplete, he allows the opportunity to slip from him. He can make great resolves, but he can only execute by a diseased impulse, and this never serves him at the right time. That speedy vengeance which was the sworn purpose of his life is here prevented by his infirmity, and a mad impulse in a subsequent scene causes him to plunge his sword into the heart of poor old Polonius instead of the heart of the real culprit, his uncle.

We now come to the extraordinary interview between Hamlet and his mother. (Act III, Scene IV.) Perhaps no scene furnishes to the non-professional reader such strong evidence as this in favor of the theory of feigning. To us, however, he appears like one who, being really and truly insane, has summoned all his powers for the accomplishment of his purposes, one of which is to convince others that he is not mad. In the true spirit which animates him, he asserts in plain words that he is not mad, only in "craft," and in

spite of all internal evidence to the contrary, most of his readers and critics are ready to believe him. "It is not madness I have uttered, bring me to the test." Unfortunately the test he relies upon, though once considered infallible, is not now regarded as quite positive; indeed, as applicable to his case it is quite worthless. It strikes us as rather strange too, that one who is really feigning for a purpose, should take so much pains to make others believe he is not doing so. He speaks rationally, yet sometimes wildly and obscurely, and the unmerciful manner in which he harrows up the feelings of his mother, blameworthy as she was, and so deserving of his severe censure, is in perfect keeping with his conduct towards Ophelia in a former scene. The re-appearance of the ghost, now visible only to himself, shows the deep agitation of his mind, and with all his self-possession he is not able to suppress the emotions caused by this mental apparition. In Scenes II, and III, of Act IV, we see another phase of his malady. That peculiar levity of conduct evinced by the insane in view of the dreadful circumstances which they have brought upon themselves by their insane acts,—circumstances which would cause the guilty sane to quiver with fear as to the consequences—is here admirably shown, as also that waywardness and perversity peculiar to certain forms of insanity. He appears to have concealed the body of Polonius, whom he has slain in an insane impulse, merely out of pure perversity, and not from any fear as to the consequences to himself from the deed. In answer to the question of Rosencrantz, "What have you done, my lord, with the dead body?" he says, quite significantly, "Compounded it with the dust, whereto 'tis kin." In the next scene, when the king asks him where is Polonius, he answers: "At supper." Not where he eats, but where he is eaten; a certain convocation of politic worms are e'en at him. Your worm is your only emperor for diet;" and he continues to rally the king with the most caustic sarcasm, showing him the ultimate identity between a fat king and a lean beggar. Again, when the king puts the question, "Where is Polonius?" he evades in a most provoking manner: "In heaven, send thither to

see; if your messenger find him not there, seek him i' the other place yourself."

We next find him bewailing his own imbecility of purpose in view of the expedition of young Fortinbras, quite conscious apparently of his infirmity, yet wholly under its influence, and totally unable to overcome it.

We now come to Scene V, Act IV, in which we find another and very different form of insanity in the case of Ophelia. Ophelia of all the creations of Shakspeare's genius, is certainly one of the most charming and exquisite. The gentle being, occasional glimpses of whom we have caught in former scenes, gliding before us for a moment, and disappearing like a vision of loveliness and purity, weeping in the heaviness of her heart over the misfortunes which have befallen her lover, and bewailing the change which his sad disease had wrought in his feelings and conduct towards her, is now doomed to fall a victim to another, and if possible more painful form of the same malady. With true feminine fortitude she has borne meekly and patiently all that the mental disease of her lover has inflicted upon herself, and in childish obedience to the will of the politic old courtier, Polonius, her father, whom, notwithstanding all his follies, she appears to have loved with the tenderness of a daughter, faithful and true, she has tried to smother, if she could not entirely quench, the pure flame which glowed in her bosom towards him. This, no doubt, cost her a sad struggle, yet in obedience to duty she could make the attempt. But when under an impulse of disease this lover plunges his sword into the heart of her beloved parent, the measure of her sorrow is full and running over. Her gentle heart, which had been so often and so sorely wounded, is now crushed forever, and her pure and delicate mind is at once hopelessly destroyed. Its native delicacy, though sadly shattered by disease, is not wholly lost, and though a maniac she is not wild, but the same gentle, loving, kind-hearted, affectionate Ophelia. Sad is the picture which the poet has here given us, yet the records of womanly experience teach us that it is only too true. After the sad exhibition she furnishes us of crushed feelings and a mind in fragments, we are quite

prepared, indeed feel a kind of relief, when death interposes to take her away from the sorrows and perplexities of her short and melancholy career.

We next meet Hamlet in the churchyard, with that same levity of character and conduct we have before glanced at as one of the characteristics of his disease. He jests with clowns, and moralizes over dry bones. Here, with all his own sorrowful experiences of human life fresh in his memory, and surrounded with the solemn evidences of the vanity of all earthly things, in the true spirit of madness he makes himself merry with things most grave and solemn. A skull "grins with a ghastly smile" upon him, and he in return smiles upon it, supposes it to have been the skull of a lawyer, and asks what has become of its "tenures" and its "tricks," and wonders why it does not bring an action for battery against the clown for knocking him about with a dirty shovel. Here he utters that terrible sarcasm against "men made of money :"—

*Ham.* "Is not parchment made of sheep-skins ?

*Hor.* "Ay, my lord, and of calves-skins too.

*Ham.* "They are sheep and calves which seek out assurance in that."

This scene with the grave-diggers is not merely rich in wit, humor, philosophy and morality, but it possesses a profound psychological interest, and it is evident that Hamlet acted very unnaturally under the circumstances, supposing him to be sane or feigning ; or supposing him to be insane, acted in the true spirit of his disease, very naturally. The latter supposition is the more reasonable.

In the midst of this singular scene in the grave-yard, the funeral procession, bearing the remains of Ophelia, enters. And here we are furnished with the poet's views respecting the obsequies paid by the church to the bodies of those unfortunates, who, in a paroxysm of the most dreadful of human maladies, commit suicide. He is evidently at issue with the priestly prejudices of his times, remnants of which have descended, and are even now occasionally manifest in the midst of the enlightenment of our own. The poet seems to have felt instinctively that the bodies of those, who, urged by a paroxysm



of disease, beyond the power of self-control, have perished by their own hands, should have the same sad rites as those who have perished from any other cause, and that withholding them could do no possible good, and inflict much unnecessary injury upon the feelings of friends:—

*Laer.* "Must there no more be done?"

*Priest.* "No more be done!"

We should profane the service of the dead,  
To sing sage *requiem*, and such rest to her,  
As to peace-parted souls.

*Laer.* "Lay her i' the earth;

And from her fair and unpolluted flesh,  
May violets spring! I tell thee, churlish priest,  
A ministering angel shall my sister be,  
When thou liest howling."

The wild manifestations of sorrow on the part of Laertes at the grave of his sister, which Hamlet has observed at a distance, very naturally excite in him a paroxysm of his malady, and his conduct here establishes beyond all question the existence of genuine madness. At times he could control himself completely, and act and talk rationally, yet ever since the interview with the ghost, even during these intervals, may be detected the genuine manifestations of that disease, which is ready to burst out in marked paroxysms upon occasions of unusual excitement like this. He here rushes forward, leaps into the grave, grapples with Laertes, and disputes with him the position of chief-mourner; and his language as well as his conduct leads us to coincide with the queen when she says:—

"This is mere madness:

And thus awhile the fit will work on him;  
Anon, as patient as the female dove  
When that her golden complets are disclos'd,  
His silence will sit drooping."

Alternately calm and excited, we find him, in the next scene, relating with great circumspection the means he adopted to circumvent his transportation to England, and to devote his treacherous companions to the same fate they had, in concert with the king, intended for him. He also expresses his regret that the "towering passion"

which the grief of Laertes put him in, should have made him forget himself towards him at the grave of Ophelia.

The wild confusion of the last scene, furnishes us a fitting denouement of what has preceded. It was not to be expected that a drama in which the principal actor is an undoubted madman, should end as one in which other materials are employed. The mental malady of Hamlet was of such a character as to influence deeply the whole plot, and in the end we see the irresolution, feebleness of will and want of foresight resulting from it, bringing about just what was to be expected, a complete chaos. Each dies as it were by accident, and by the means intended for the destruction of another. These means seem like the "times," "out of joint," and hobble on to the accomplishment of purposes, vague, indistinct and uncertain. Vengeance indeed falls upon the head of the chief culprit, not however in the solemn manner to give it a character suited to his enormous guilt, but just as we might expect from the nature of the instrumentalities employed, the only way in fact it could have been brought about, with the preservation of the complete dramatic consistency of the plot; the whole furnishing another evidence of the wonderful sagacity of the poet, and the truthfulness to nature and consistency with which he works out whatever he undertakes.

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL.

---

*Statistics of the Establishments for the Insane in France, from 1842 to 1853, inclusive.* By M. LEGOYT.

In 1843, the French "*Bureau de la Statistique Générale*," published a series of tables, showing the condition and management of Insane Asylums in France, from 1835 to 1844, inclusive. In 1857, a continuation of the same series was published, giving similar statistics for the twelve years from 1842 to 1853, inclusive, and bringing the report forward to the close of 1853.

The extent of this work and the laborious nature of its details seem astonishing to one not familiar with the minute precision and the ingenious exactness, which characterise the labors of the French statisticians. The published work is composed of two parts. The first part, relative to the eleven years, 1842-52, gives the general results of progress from year to year; with tables of admissions, discharges, &c.; the number of patients for each department, and for each asylum in particular; its admissions, discharges and deaths for each year. The second part is devoted specially to the statistics of the year 1853, and is even more minute and specific. Under the head of "Administrative Management," it details not only the admissions and discharges, but the number of lunatics to be found in every department of France, either in public or private charge; the price per diem paid for their maintenance and treatment; together with the relative share in these expenses borne by government, by the various departments, by each commune, and even by the different hospitals and private families throughout the empire.

Under the head of "Medical and Physiological Observations," it gives as minutely as possible a series of facts, which enables the reader to appreciate the influence exerted upon the development of insanity, upon the mortality and the results of treatment in this un-

fortunate class, by sex, by age, by civil condition, by degree of education, by occupation, by season of the year, and by social position. It contains also some well-digested hints upon the probable causes of lunacy, making the usual triple distinction of the same into predisposing, physical and moral.

Complete as these tables seem to be, and as they doubtless are in most respects, there are two sources of error which we must mention at the outset, and which, we regret to say, must necessarily affect the exactness of the results, and detract somewhat from their value in the minds of specialists. Of these the first is, the failure to classify separately the idiots and cretins which are found in the various asylums. The second is, that of counting among the admissions many cases which have been discharged apparently well, and shortly re-admitted after a relapse; also those who have made their escape from the asylums, and are soon retaken; and finally, those cases which are merely transferred from one asylum to another. To count all these cases as admissions, is manifestly unjust. Both these errors will be corrected in subsequent reports, and official measures, it appears, have been taken since 1856, to secure a degree of exactness in recording the statistics, which will render them almost absolutely perfect.

At the close of the year 1855, the whole number of institutions in France devoted entirely or in part to the treatment of lunatics, was one hundred and eleven. Of these, sixty-five were public institutions, and forty-six were private. Under public asylums, may be reckoned those which pertain to the government, to the various departments, to communes, and to almshouses, thus:—

Belonging to Government, (Maison de Charenton), .....	1
“ Departments, .....	37
“ Communes, .....	1
“ Almshouses, .....	26
Total, .....	65

In this number are included certain establishments which are not strictly public asylums, *i. e.*, not authorized as such; for example, certain poorhouses, where persons suffering from mental disease, chiefly idiots and incurables, are harbored or maintained by public sanction, if not at public expense. This, however, does not apply to

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL.

---

*Statistics of the Establishments for the Insane in France, from 1842 to 1853, inclusive.* By M. LEGOYT.

In 1843, the French "*Bureau de la Statistique Générale*," published a series of tables, showing the condition and management of Insane Asylums in France, from 1835 to 1844, inclusive. In 1857, a continuation of the same series was published, giving similar statistics for the twelve years from 1842 to 1853, inclusive, and bringing the report forward to the close of 1853.

The extent of this work and the laborious nature of its details seem astonishing to one not familiar with the minute precision and the ingenious exactness, which characterise the labors of the French statisticians. The published work is composed of two parts. The first part, relative to the eleven years, 1842-52, gives the general results of progress from year to year; with tables of admissions, discharges, &c.; the number of patients for each department, and for each asylum in particular; its admissions, discharges and deaths for each year. The second part is devoted specially to the statistics of the year 1853, and is even more minute and specific. Under the head of "Administrative Management," it details not only the admissions and discharges, but the number of lunatics to be found in every department of France, either in public or private charge; the price per diem paid for their maintenance and treatment; together with the relative share in these expenses borne by government, by the various departments, by each commune, and even by the different hospitals and private families throughout the empire.

Under the head of "Medical and Physiological Observations," it gives as minutely as possible a series of facts, which enables the reader to appreciate the influence exerted upon the development of insanity, upon the mortality and the results of treatment in this un-



fortunate class, by sex, by age, by civil condition, by degree of education, by occupation, by season of the year, and by social position. It contains also some well-digested hints upon the probable causes of lunacy, making the usual triple distinction of the same into predisposing, physical and moral.

Complete as these tables seem to be, and as they doubtless are in most respects, there are two sources of error which we must mention at the outset, and which, we regret to say, must necessarily affect the exactness of the results, and detract somewhat from their value in the minds of specialists. Of these the first is, the failure to classify separately the idiots and cretins which are found in the various asylums. The second is, that of counting among the admissions many cases which have been discharged apparently well, and shortly re-admitted after a relapse; also those who have made their escape from the asylums, and are soon retaken; and finally, those cases which are merely transferred from one asylum to another. To count all these cases as admissions, is manifestly unjust. Both these errors will be corrected in subsequent reports, and official measures, it appears, have been taken since 1856, to secure a degree of exactness in recording the statistics, which will render them almost absolutely perfect.

At the close of the year 1855, the whole number of institutions in France devoted entirely or in part to the treatment of lunatics, was one hundred and eleven. Of these, sixty-five were public institutions, and forty-six were private. Under public asylums, may be reckoned those which pertain to the government, to the various departments, to communes, and to almshouses, thus:—

Belonging to Government, (Maison de Charenton),	1
“ Departments,	37
“ Communes,	1
“ Almshouses,	26
Total,	65

In this number are included certain establishments which are not strictly public asylums, *i. e.*, not authorized as such; for example, certain poorhouses, where persons suffering from mental disease, chiefly idiots and incurables, are harbored or maintained by public sanction, if not at public expense. This, however, does not apply to

those establishments where cases may be admitted temporarily, to await a transfer elsewhere.\*

French asylums appropriated exclusively to male patients, . . . . .	11
" " " " " female patients, . . . . .	17
" " " in which both sexes are received, . . . . .	83

Of the 28 which are appropriated exclusively to either sex, are reckoned,—Departmental asylums, 8; Almshouse-asylums, 7; Private asylums, 13.

The 111 asylums, (including those of every class,) are distributed among 61 departments. The largest number in any one department (*de la Seine*), is 16. Several other departments have a number of asylums ranging from 2 to 8. Forty-one have each a single asylum within their limits, while in twenty-five departments no provision whatever has been made for the treatment of this unfortunate class.

This unequal distribution of so large a number of asylums, seems most unfortunate and unwise. The population of the twenty-five departments which are unprovided with even a single asylum was, (according to the census of 1851,) 8,908,923, or one-fourth of the entire population of the empire. It seems, therefore, that one-fourth of all the families of France, in case of the discovery of mental alienation in their midst, have no resource but to seek at the hands of a neighboring department the care and the curative measures the emergency demands, and which unhappily their own limits do not furnish. This state of things diminishes the chances for recovery, as well as limits the number of those who would seek the benefits of an institution. Families are often, from a humane but unwise impulse,

\* Previous to 1844, it is difficult to determine the exact number of asylums in France, either public or private. This uncertainty is due to the incompleteness of returns made by officials to government, and the unreliable nature of many facts stated.

Six of the 37 departmental asylums were opened during the ten years, 1844-54, and two or three others have been changed into such from almshouse-asylums, (*hospices*). During the same ten years the number of private asylums has but slightly varied. Three have been closed, either voluntarily or by public authority, and four others have been newly licensed.

In the number of almshouse establishments devoted to the reception of lunatics the official reports mention no instance of a new license, while many have been changed into almshouse-asylums or have been suppressed altogether.

unwilling to be separated entirely from a relative under such circumstances, and thus great numbers of unfortunates remain at home, receiving no treatment and rarely recovering; a burden or a terror to their families, and too frequently even propagating their own sad disease without restraint.

To such destitution as this, fortunately, the United States presents no parallel. We may add, in regard to the geography of the twenty-five departments thus unprovided, that—

10 belong to the South of France, | 3 belong to the East of France,  
9 " " Centre " " | 3 " " North " "

All the western departments are provided with at least *one* asylum each.

In classifying the 111 asylums of France according to their capacity of accommodation, we use the tabular form, as follows:—

CAPACITY OF ASYLUMS.		Asylums of State, De- part'm'ts, or Communes.	Alms-house Asylums.	Private Asylums.	Totals.
For less than 50 patients,	.....	1	6	25	32
" 50 to 100 "	.....	2	4	5	11
" 100 to 200 "	.....	10	6	9	25
" 200 to 300 "	.....	10	3	1	14
" 300 to 400 "	.....	8	2	2	12
" more than 400 "	.....	8	5	4	17
Totals,	.....	39	26	46	111

Of the 17 asylums which contain more than 400 patients, the first is the Salpêtrière, at Paris, which contained in 1853, the astonishing number of 1324 patients. This is an asylum exclusively for females. The total number of patients in these 17 asylums was, in 1853, 10,935, or more than 40 per cent. of all the lunatics under treatment in the whole of France.

#### POPULATION OF ALL THE ASYLUMS OF FRANCE SINCE 1835.

In 1835, the first census was taken of the insane under treatment throughout the empire. Since that time (excepting in 1850, when a diminution is observed, which is due to the ravages of the cholera in 1849,) the number has increased year by year. We give an ab-

abstract of the tables, which will be sufficient for our purpose. The number of patients in all the French asylums was,—

January 1, 1835.....	10,539	January 1, 1850.....	20,061
" 1840.....	13,283	" 1851.....	21,353
" 1845.....	17,089	" 1854.....	24,524

Thus we see that this population doubled itself from 1835 to 1851, and its increase during 19 years was 13,985, or 133 per cent. In tracing this progressive advance from year to year, we are struck with the fact that the proportion of increase for several later years is lessened. This is most easily seen by arranging the 15 years, 1839-54, in periods of 5 years each, thus :—

PERIOD.	Increase of inmates.	Rate of increase for each per'd.	Do. for each year.
1839 to 1844.....	3,678	29.24 p. ct.	5.85 p.c.
1844 " 1849.....	3,976	24.46 "	4.89 "
1849 " 1854.....	4,293	21.22 "	4.24 "

The annual rate of increase for the first period, 5.85 per cent., is reduced in the next 5 years to 4.39 per cent., and in the period, 1849-54, we find it 4.24 per cent.; a result which allows the hope that in a more or less distant future, the number of insane patients in France may cease to show any increase whatever.

The next tables in order in the French report, are those relating to the classification of insane patients according to sex. This classification shows not only a preponderance of female cases under treatment, but this preponderance has of late years very considerably increased. From 1842 to 1854, the average number of patients under treatment was, males, 9,314; females, 10,177. In 1841 the proportion of females to males, was as 102 to 100. From 1842 to 1854, it was as 109 to 100. The first impression from this might be, that females are more liable than males to mental disease; whereas we shall hereafter see that the reverse is the truth. The true explanation of the difference is found in the fact that male patients invariably remain a shorter time under treatment than females, and also that the deaths of males in asylums, greatly exceed in number those of females.

PROPORTION OF LUNATICS UNDER TREATMENT TO THE WHOLE POPULATION OF FRANCE.

If we compare the number of patients in asylums during the years 1836, 1841, 1846, 1851, with the entire population of France, we find the following results:—

YEARS.	Population of France.	Patients in Asylums.	Proportion of Patients to the Population.
1836, .....	33,540,910	11,091	33 to 100,000 or 1 to 3,024
1841, .....	34,240,178	13,887	41 " " " " 2,465
1846, .....	35,400,486	18,013	51 " " " " 1,965
1851, .....	35,783,170	21,353	60 " " " " 1,676

As regards sex, the proportions are as follows:—

*Males* —In 1846, .48 to 100,000 inhabitants, or 1 in 2,063  
 " 1851, .57 " " " " " 1,731

*Females*—In 1846, .53 to 100,000 inhabitants, or 1 in 1,877  
 " 1851, .61 " " " " " 1,625

It appears, therefore, that females under treatment exceed males by one tenth. We have already attributed this preponderance of females to the constant excess of male discharges and deaths.

The next subject considered in the report, is that of—

LUNATICS MAINTAINED AT HOME, AND THEIR NUMBER IN PROPORTION TO THAT OF LUNATICS UNDER TREATMENT IN ASYLUMS.

According to the census of 1851, there were at that time in France 44,970 cases of mental disease. These are divided as follows:—

Under treatment in various establishments, 20,537, or 45 per cent.

At home, ..... 24,433, or 55 " "

Total, ..... 44,970, or 1 in 796 of whole pop.

"The number here given of the cases in asylums," the Report adds, "may be somewhat under-estimated, since only those cases are reckoned which are actually under treatment, omitting all persons who may be temporarily placed in institutions, either for purposes of transfer or otherwise. The estimate, therefore, above given, is doubtless below the truth." With much more reason should we suspect the truth of the second estimate, that of the lunatics at home. The almost universal reluctance of friends to acknowledge cases of family derangement, and the desire, dictated by either humanity or policy,



tract of the tables, which will be sufficient for our purpose. The number of patients in all the French asylums was,—

January 1, 1835.....	10,539	January 1, 1850.....	20,061
" 1840.....	13,283	" 1851.....	21,353
" 1845.....	17,089	" 1854.....	24,524

Thus we see that this population doubled itself from 1835 to 1851, and its increase during 19 years was 13,985, or 133 per cent. In tracing this progressive advance from year to year, we are struck with the fact that the proportion of increase for several later years is lessened. This is most easily seen by arranging the 15 years, 1839-54, in periods of 5 years each, thus :—

PERIOD.	Increase of inmates.	Rate of increase for each per'd.	Do. for each year.
1839 to 1844.....	3,678	29.24 p. ct.	5.85 p.c.
1844 " 1849.....	3,976	24.46 "	4.89 "
1849 " 1854.....	4,293	21.22 "	4.24 "

The annual rate of increase for the first period, 5.85 per cent., is reduced in the next 5 years to 4.39 per cent., and in the period, 1849-54, we find it 4.24 per cent. ; a result which allows the hope that in a more or less distant future, the number of insane patients in France may cease to show any increase whatever.

The next tables in order in the French report, are those relating to the classification of insane patients according to sex. This classification shows not only a preponderance of female cases under treatment, but this preponderance has of late years very considerably increased. From 1842 to 1854, the average number of patients under treatment was, males, 9,314 ; females, 10,177. In 1841 the proportion of females to males, was as 102 to 100. From 1842 to 1854, it was as 109 to 100. The first impression from this might be, that females are more liable than males to mental disease ; whereas we shall hereafter see that the reverse is the truth. The true explanation of the difference is found in the fact that male patients invariably remain a shorter time under treatment than females, and also that the deaths of males in asylums, greatly exceed in number those of females.

PROPORTION OF LUNATICS UNDER TREATMENT TO THE WHOLE POPULATION OF FRANCE.

If we compare the number of patients in asylums during the years 1836, 1841, 1846, 1851, with the entire population of France, we find the following results:—

YEARS.	Population of France.	Patients in Asylums.	Proportion of Patients to the Population.
1836, .....	33,540,910	11,091	33 to 100,000 or 1 to 3,024
1841, .....	34,240,178	13,887	41 " " " " 2,465
1846, .....	35,400,486	18,013	51 " " " " 1,965
1851, .....	35,783,170	21,353	60 " " " " 1,676

As regards sex, the proportions are as follows:—

*Males* —In 1846, .48 to 100,000 inhabitants, or 1 in 2,063

" 1851, .57 " " " " 1,731

*Females*—In 1846, .53 to 100,000 inhabitants, or 1 in 1,877

" 1851, .61 " " " " 1,625

It appears, therefore, that females under treatment exceed males by one tenth. We have already attributed this preponderance of females to the constant excess of male discharges and deaths.

The next subject considered in the report, is that of—

LUNATICS MAINTAINED AT HOME, AND THEIR NUMBER IN PROPORTION TO THAT OF LUNATICS UNDER TREATMENT IN ASYLUMS.

According to the census of 1851, there were at that time in France 44,970 cases of mental disease. These are divided as follows:—

Under treatment in various establishments, 20,537, or 45 per cent.

At home, ..... 24,433, or 55 " "

Total, ..... 44,970, or 1 in 796 of whole pop.

"The number here given of the cases in asylums," the Report adds, "may be somewhat under-estimated, since only those cases are reckoned which are actually under treatment, omitting all persons who may be temporarily placed in institutions, either for purposes of transfer or otherwise. The estimate, therefore, above given, is doubtless below the truth." With much more reason should we suspect the truth of the second estimate, that of the lunatics at home. The almost universal reluctance of friends to acknowledge cases of family derangement, and the desire, dictated by either humanity or policy,

to conceal such facts from the authorities, to avoid the exposure of a public record, will necessarily operate to render such tables incomplete. We may, therefore be, assured that the above estimate is at least not exaggerated, and allowing this fact, we come at once to the conclusion that 24,000 insane persons, or more than half of all the lunatics in France, are detained at home, and deprived of the benefits and the comforts of an asylum; not to mention the sacrifice of chances for recovery, which are universally admitted to attend a removal from the cares and associations and excitements of home. In view also of the public safety, if more than half a nation's lunatics be at large, or at least under the imperfect restraints of home, is society to have no assurance that these shall be harmless? In the constant liability to outbreak and disturbance, in the summing up of public and private anxiety, in the frequent recurrence of accidents and crime, which must unavoidably attend such a state of things, is there no added burden to the State, and no increased responsibility to the conservators of the public peace?

The details of these tables (for which we have no space,) show that the six departments where are found most lunatics at home, belong to the twenty-five already alluded to as having no asylum whatever for insane cases; while the ten departments where are found the fewest lunatics at home, have at least one asylum each within their borders. This can surprise no one. The departments which are supplied with asylum-advantages, would naturally have fewer lunatics at home than the others. To make this still more plain, let us compare, in a tabular form, the number of the insane at home in the twenty-five departments, with the same class in the other sixty-one departments of France, thus:—

DEPARTMENTS.	Population in 1851.	Insane at home in '51.	Proportion in 100,000 inhabitants.
In the 25 departments having no asylum, .....	8,908,923	7,225	73.24
In the 61 departments having one or more asylums,	26,874,227	17,208	64.03
For the whole of France, .....	35,783,170	24,433	68.28

Passing over Chapter III, of the Report, which relates to the details of the internal economy of the French asylums, we come to Chapter IV., which is devoted to the subject of "Admissions." Of this, the first subdivision is—

THE NUMBER AND INCREASE OF ADMISSIONS TO ASYLUMS SINCE 1835.

The constant increase already marked in the cases under treatment, is also noticed in the admissions.

In 1835	the number	admitted	to French	asylums	was	3,917
" 1840	"	"	"	"	"	5,433
" 1845	"	"	"	"	"	7,518
" 1850	"	"	"	"	"	8,184
" 1851	"	"	"	"	"	8,592
" 1852	"	"	"	"	"	9,782
" 1853	"	"	"	"	"	9,081

During a period of nineteen years the whole number of admissions was 128,542, or an average of rather more than 6,765 per annum. In 1852 the number reached its maximum. If we compare this with the number of admissions in 1835, we find it almost triple.

"What can be the cause?" (we quote from the Report.) "of this enormous augmentation? Is it a consequence of the increased number of our asylums, their enlargement, and their approved appliances for usefulness? Or, on the other hand, does insanity—as some have urged—claim annually, more and more victims? Can we believe that this cruel scourge follows the development of civilization itself? that it keeps pace with the progress of public education, with industrial and commercial activity, with the growth of public wealth, with the ardent strife for honor and for power, with the panting race for fortune, for ease and for luxury, which so peculiarly characterize the present age? The feverish excitements which are forced upon the mind by the uncertainties of political life, with its passions, its wranglings, its disappointments and its snares—could these be regarded as fatal to reason? The revolutions, the financial and industrial crises, the unbridled speculations, the reverses of fortune, the ebb and flow of emigration, and those social convulsions which seem inevitable to the present constitution of society—would these necessarily produce a similar effect? These are grave questions, nor can we pretend to answer them until the sphere of our observation shall be enlarged, and especially until the census of many succeeding years shall allow us to compare the number of the insane at home with that of the insane treated in special asylums. For the present our investigations must remain incomplete."

to conceal such facts from the authorities, to avoid the exposure of a public record, will necessarily operate to render such tables incomplete. We may, therefore be, assured that the above estimate is at least not exaggerated, and allowing this fact, we come at once to the conclusion that 24,000 insane persons, or more than half of all the lunatics in France, are detained at home, and deprived of the benefits and the comforts of an asylum; not to mention the sacrifice of chances for recovery, which are universally admitted to attend a removal from the cares and associations and excitements of home. In view also of the public safety, if more than half a nation's lunatics be at large, or at least under the imperfect restraints of home, is society to have no assurance that these shall be harmless? In the constant liability to outbreak and disturbance, in the summing up of public and private anxiety, in the frequent recurrence of accidents and crime, which must unavoidably attend such a state of things, is there no added burden to the State, and no increased responsibility to the conservators of the public peace?

The details of these tables (for which we have no space,) show that the six departments where are found most lunatics at home, belong to the twenty-five already alluded to as having no asylum whatever for insane cases; while the ten departments where are found the fewest lunatics at home, have at least one asylum each within their borders. This can surprise no one. The departments which are supplied with asylum-advantages, would naturally have fewer lunatics at home than the others. To make this still more plain, let us compare, in a tabular form, the number of the insane at home in the twenty-five departments, with the same class in the other sixty-one departments of France, thus:—

DEPARTMENTS.	Population in 1851.	Insane at home in '51.	Proportion in 100,000 inhabitants.
In the 25 departments having no asylum, . . . . .	8,908,923	7,225	73.24
In the 61 departments having one or more asylums, . . . . .	26,874,227	17,208	64.03
For the whole of France, . . . . .	35,783,170	24,433	68.28



Passing over Chapter III, of the Report, which relates to the details of the internal economy of the French asylums, we come to Chapter IV., which is devoted to the subject of "Admissions." Of this, the first subdivision is—

THE NUMBER AND INCREASE OF ADMISSIONS TO ASYLUMS SINCE 1853.

The constant increase already marked in the cases under treatment, is also noticed in the admissions.

In 1835	the number	admitted	to French	asylums	was	3,917
" 1840	"	"	"	"	"	5,433
" 1845	"	"	"	"	"	7,518
" 1850	"	"	"	"	"	8,184
" 1851	"	"	"	"	"	8,592
" 1852	"	"	"	"	"	9,782
" 1853	"	"	"	"	"	9,081

During a period of nineteen years the whole number of admissions was 128,542, or an average of rather more than 6,765 per annum. In 1852 the number reached its maximum. If we compare this with the number of admissions in 1835, we find it almost triple.

"What can be the cause" (we quote from the Report,) "of this enormous augmentation? Is it a consequence of the increased number of our asylums, their enlargement, and their approved appliances for usefulness? Or, on the other hand, does insanity—as some have urged—claim annually, more and more victims? Can we believe that this cruel scourge follows the development of civilization itself? that it keeps pace with the progress of public education, with industrial and commercial activity, with the growth of public wealth, with the ardent strife for honor and for power, with the panting race for fortune, for ease and for luxury, which so peculiarly characterize the present age? The feverish excitements which are forced upon the mind by the uncertainties of political life, with its passions, its wranglings, its disappointments and its snares—could these be regarded as fatal to reason? The revolutions, the financial and industrial crises, the unbridled speculations, the reverses of fortune, the ebb and flow of emigration, and those social convulsions which seem inevitable to the present constitution of society—would these necessarily produce a similar effect? These are grave questions, nor can we pretend to answer them until the sphere of our observation shall be enlarged, and especially until the census of many succeeding years shall allow us to compare the number of the insane at home with that of the insane treated in special asylums. For the present our investigations must remain incomplete."

There is, however, a partial answer given to the question, in the following considerations, which are wholly independent of psychological influences.

First, as we have already intimated, the erection in different parts of the country of new asylums, with increased accommodations for patients. Secondly, the great improvements in their management; the substitution of moral and rational means for the harsh treatment which once terrified families and disgraced our specialty; the attraction which is exerted more or less widely by the names of distinguished physicians, who are charged with the management of asylums; the gradual weakening of the opinion once so prevalent, that insanity is incurable; the moderate expense of maintaining patients in very many asylums: also, the moral and physical difficulties which beset the management and treatment of a lunatic at home; the greatly increased facilities for travelling, which allow of the easy conveyance of patients to almost any distance; and finally, and above all other considerations, the gratuitous treatment of the poor, in cases where reason is not irrecoverably lost. We may thus encourage the hope that if the number of those received annually in asylums be gradually augmented, on the other hand the number of those maintained, or, we might almost say, *detained* at home, may in its turn diminish.

In addition to the other reasons for this recent increase of admissions, we must not omit to mention the numerous abuses which are practised by municipal authorities, and even by families, in imposing upon these establishments the charge of great numbers of paupers, under pretext of some form of mental alienation. These abuses have been made at different times the subject of special reports by the prefects of departments, and by the officers of asylums; but the full extent of the evil, it appears, has been only partially reached.

#### THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIAL CRISES AND AGITATIONS OF THE PUBLIC MIND UPON THE DEVELOPMENT OF INSANITY.

We have already alluded to the opinions of certain authors, who assert that revolutions, wars, industrial crises, and generally all those

unforeseen and startling events which from time to time interrupt the noiseless tenor of society, by the derangement or by the sacrifice of large interests, increase the number of admissions to asylums for the insane. But the statistics which we have examined do not confirm this observation. In fact, the year 1848, in spite of the revolution of February, and the extraordinary industrial disturbances which followed it, presents by comparison with 1847, fewer admissions. During the latter year they reached 7,688, and in 1848 they fell to 7,341, being 345 less. It is also worthy of note that this diminution was apparent even in the department of the Seine,\* where the consequences of the revolution of 1848 were most severely felt. Of this department, the number of admissions to asylums public and private was :—

In 1846, .....	1,957	In 1848, .....	1,871
" 1847, .....	1,876	" 1849, .....	1,906

From these results one might almost be tempted to believe that great social crises have ceased to agitate materially the public, simply by the fact of their frequent occurrence.

We may, however, add, that the prolonged disturbance of the administrative service in 1848, under the influence of political prejudice, can explain in a great measure the diminution of admissions for that year. In 1852, when some of those most serious political events had been accomplished, (but this time in the sense of a return to the establishment of order and authority,) we observe the phenomenon of an unparalleled increase in the number of admissions, (9,782). This result, however, corresponds with the increase in the discharges before or after recovery. The discharges were :—

In 1850, .....	4,402	In 1852, [rising to the number]	5,442
" 1851, .....	4,519	" 1853, [falling again to]	4,872

The cholera of 1849 appears not to have exercised an influence corresponding to that of 1832, which, according to the testimony of many observers, had produced a large number of cases of mental disease, as the result of panic. In 1848, the number of admissions to

\*Containing the city of Paris and environs.

asylums was 7,341, and in 1849 it was 7,536; an increase only of 195.

PROPORTION WHICH THE ANNUAL ADMISSIONS TO ASYLUMS BEAR TO  
THE ENTIRE POPULATION OF FRANCE.

During the 19 years already selected for observation, the proportion for the whole of France was as follows:—

From 1835 to 1838,	1 admission to	7,661 inhabitants.
" 1839 " 1843, "	" "	" 5,649 "
" 1844 " 1848, "	" "	" 4,714 "
" 1849 " 1853, "	" "	" 4,144 "

For the single department of the Seine:—

From 1835 to 1838,	1 admission to	595 inhabitants.
" 1839 " 1843, "	" "	" 580 "
" 1844 " 1848, "	" "	" 568 "
" 1849 " 1853, "	" "	" 516 "

We thus find the proportion during the period 1849-53, for the single department of the Seine, more than ten times as great as that for all the other departments together. This is not surprising, when we consider that this department includes the city of Paris and its environs. The peculiar circumstances of a vast city like the capital of France, render it of course necessary to regard as dangerous, and to place in confinement, not only actual maniacs, but idiots and imbeciles, cases of senile dementia, and indeed every individual deprived of the power of self-control. To this cause may be added the just reputation which the metropolitan asylums enjoy throughout the empire, and also the advantages which they offer to wealthy families for placing their friends under treatment secretly, and thus avoiding the exposure of their occasional or hereditary infirmities.

ADMISSIONS ACCORDING TO SEX, FROM 1842 TO 1853.

The relative liability of the sexes to mental disease, is a subject upon which authors have widely differed. Some have regarded this infirmity as more usual among males, while others have insisted that it is more frequent among females, whose organization is more delicate and more impressible, the emotional faculties predominating in a more marked degree over those of the stronger sex. The following table seems to settle this question:—

PERIOD.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Per cent. of Males.	Per cent. Females.	Ratio of Males to Females.
Total number of admissions to Asylums in France, from 1842 to 1853,...	50,194	43,975	94,169	53.30	46.70	1.14

From the details of the table (of which the above is merely an abstract, giving the totals,) it appears that during the twelve years, 1842-54, the number of annual male admissions has constantly exceeded that of females in a ratio which amounts to more than 14 per cent., and, what is remarkable, this average ratio, based upon the statistics of more than 94,000 admissions, varies only from 8 to 14 per cent. during the twelve years selected. And as in the entire population of France, there are more females than males, we may conclude with confidence that insanity is a disease to which men are more subject than women.

The same excess of male admissions over female, is recorded in the statistics of the public and private asylums of the department of the Seine :—

PERIOD.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Per cent. of Males.	Per cent. Females.	Ratio of Males to Females.
For the 12 years, 1842-54, total admissions, .....	11,842	11,363	23,205	51.03	48.97	1.04

According to the census of 1851, and the annual average of admissions during the period of five years, 1849-54, we find for the whole of France—

1 admission to every 3,864 of male population.

“ “ “ 4,473 “ female “

In the department of the Seine—

1 admission to every 702 males. | 1 admission to every 692 females.

#### INFLUENCE OF AGE.

The admissions to the various French asylums during the year 1853, are thus classified according to age :—



AGE.	NO. OF ADMISSIONS.		
	Males.	Females.	Total.
Under 14 years, .....	310	256	566
From 14 to 20 years, .....	662	581	1,243
" 20 to 25 " .....	1,274	1,169	2,443
" 25 to 30 " .....	1,850	1,619	3,469
" 30 to 35 " .....	2,312	1,845	4,157
" 35 to 40 " .....	2,272	2,041	4,313
" 40 to 50 " .....	3,447	3,564	7,011
" 50 to 60 " .....	2,035	2,575	4,610
" 60 to 70 " .....	762	1,260	2,022
70 and over " .....	303	536	839
Age unknown, .....	1,186	1,017	2,203
Totals, .....	16,413	16,463	32,876

If it were possible to regard the age at the time of admission as the date also of the attack, we should infer from this document that mental derangement does not often exhibit itself until after puberty. Commencing from that epoch, the disease moves on, so to speak, in a parallel line with the progress of the advancing intellect, and thus becomes more and more frequent until 35 or 40 years of age, the period of life when the intellectual development usually attains its maximum. Of 1,000 cases of insanity, 141 declare themselves between these two periods. The danger of an acute attack diminishes gradually until old age, when we observe more of mental decrepitude, known as senile dementia.

Insanity in all its forms shows itself somewhat later in women than in men. Of 1,000 male patients, the disease appeared in 570 before the fortieth year, while of 1,000 females, 485 only became insane before that age. Between 50 and 60, females are much more liable to mental disturbance than males, the proportion being, in every 1,000 cases, 167 females to 134 males. This result accords with the generally received opinion, that the critical period of woman's life predisposes to insanity.

To sum up all the cases under treatment in 1853, and take the average age at which they were admitted to treatment, we find it—

For males, .....	39 years 1 month.
" females, .....	41 " 9 "
" both sexes, .....	40 " 5 "

The mean age, therefore, of admission to asylums, is forty years and five months.

#### INFLUENCE OF DOMESTIC RELATIONS.

The 32,876 insane persons under treatment in 1853, may be classified according to their domestic relations at the time of admission to the various French asylums, as follows:—

CONDITION.	NO. OF PATIENTS IN 1853.		
	Males.	Females.	Both Sexes.
Single, .....	9,278	8,800	18,078
Married, .....	4,047	4,446	8,493
Widows or Widowers, .....	791	1,888	2,679
Unknown, .....	2,297	1,329	3,626
Totals, .....	16,413	16,463	32,876

We give also, classified as above, the entire population of France, deduction being made of those under 15 years,\* as follows:—

CONDITION.	NO. OF INHABITANTS OF 15 Y'RS & UPWARDS.		
	Males.	Females.	Both Sexes.
Single, .....	5,010,616	4,549,944	9,560,560
Married, .....	6,986,223	6,948,828	13,935,051
Widows or Widowers, .....	836,509	1,687,583	2,524,092
Totals, .....	12,833,348	13,186,355	26,019,703

One of the most remarkable facts brought to light by the above tables, is the large proportion of unmarried persons admitted to the asylums; being for both sexes 61.80 per cent. of all those under treatment.

In the whole population at large, deducting all under 15 years, we find only 36.74 per cent. unmarried inhabitants, being a proportion of more than one-third less than we find in the asylums.

The same fact has already been noticed by certain psychologists, who have attributed it to a special predisposition to insanity on the part of those living in celibacy. "The solitude of the unmarried

\*As insanity is rarely noticed before the age of fifteen years, it would manifestly be unjust to establish a comparison between the unmarried, married and widowed of the whole population, without excepting all whose youth will hardly allow of their being married.

This table is based upon the census of 1851.

state," they say, "the absence of the cares, the affections and the joys of the family, leaves a man unarmed against many of the trials and the temptations of married life. The hour of adversity arrives, he is plunged in sad thoughts, he encourages a sort of selfish melancholy and yields to its influence. His reason is thus more exposed to wander than that of the married man, who in similar trials enjoys the sympathies of wife and children, and in the consciousness of his duties and responsibilities as a husband and father, he possesses a courage, resignation and endurance, to which the bachelor is a stranger."

This opinion is doubtless well founded, but in explaining the difference in the admissions of this class, it should not be forgotten that, in the nature of the case, from the very isolation of the single man, his removal to an asylum might be a necessity, while a married man could receive oftentimes, in the bosom of his family, that care which might conduce to his recovery.

In 1857, the proportion which unmarried patients over 15 years of age bore to the whole population at large, was—

Of Bachelors or Maids, .....	1 in 529 inhabitants.
" Widows or Widowers, .....	1 " 942 "
" those Married, .....	1 " 1,641 "

#### PROFESSIONS AND VOCATIONS.

Of 32,876 inmates of the various French asylums in 1853, it was found impossible to ascertain the professions of more than 27,620. These are classified as follows :—

PROFESSIONS.	NO. OF PATIENTS.			Whole No. of each Profession, (Census of 1851).	Proport'n of insane in each Prof. (in 1853) to Populat'n at large.
	Males.	Females.	Both Sexes.		
Liberal Professions, .....	1,970	1,075	3,045	1,712,082	1 to 562
Soldiers and Sailors, .....	718		718	360,185	1 " 502
Commercial pursuits, .....	709	430	1,139	2,672,467	1 " 2,347
Mechanical do. ....	6,418	4,138	10,556	15,788,038	1 " 1,495
Servants, day-laborers, &c., .....	1,791	2,568	4,359	2,808,917	1 " 644
Miscellaneous and no occupation, .....	2,553	5,250	7,803	12,441,481	1 " 1,594
Totals, .....	14,159	13,461	27,620	35,783,170	1 " 1,294

We must observe, in the first place, that one of these classes, viz., "soldiers and sailors," cannot strictly be compared with the others, since the war and navy departments provide for the immediate admission to some asylum of every soldier and sailor without exception, affected with mental disease, while very many of the other classes are not thus provided for, and are never placed under treatment. It is therefore not surprising that the military population should offer, as is indicated above, an exceptional number of admissions to the various asylums.

Next to the "soldiers and sailors," the "liberal professions" furnish the largest proportion of insane cases. After these, in order, come "servants, domestics, day-laborers, &c.," then "mechanics," and finally those engaged in "commercial pursuits."

The class of "liberal professions," according to the French Report, is made to include, in addition to the three ordinary departments of law, theology and medicine, certain miscellaneous avocations, which will perhaps seem extraordinary to the American reader, and which will require a separate table for the explanation of these statistics:—

LIBERAL PROFESSIONS.	Population in 1851.	No. of cases treated.	Proport'n of cases treat- ed to whole population.
Artists, (painters, sculptors, architects, engravers, musicians), .....	23,839	229	1 to 104
Jurists, (judges, advocates, notaries, lawyers, and bailiffs), .....	30,050	253	1 " 119
Ecclesiastics, (monks and nuns), .....	82,371	341	1 " 253
Physicians, (surgeons, apothecaries, and midwives), .....	39,424	152	1 " 259
Professors and men of letters, .....	93,032	332	1 " 280
Public officeholders and employés, .....	272,440	375	1 " 727
Proprietors and tenants, .....	1,170,926	1,363	1 " 806

From this table, we learn that the proportion of "artists" in the French asylums is nearly eight times greater than that of "proprietors and tenants;" seven times that of "jurists;" five times that of "priests and physicians," and four times that of "literary men."

Of the sum of all these classes, we find the large proportion of 1 insane person to every 205 inhabitants; while for the whole popu-

lation, we have already noted the proportion as 1 to 1,294 inhabitants.

This result confirms the generally-admitted view, that those pursuits which demand a continued exercise of the intellectual and reflective faculties, are most favorable to the development of mental disease.

In the category of "commercial pursuits," are reckoned all those who sell, either in a large or a small way, those products which are or are not the result of their own labor. Manufacturers, therefore, as well as merchants and those engaged in the various branches of commerce, must be included in the number. In proportion to the number of individuals which it embraces, this class reckons a very small number of insane cases. In the asylums they stand as 1 to 25, while among the population at large, this class represents one-seventh of all the inhabitants of France.

Under the head of "mechanical pursuits," comprising the farmers and the artisans (strictly so called), we find that the proportion of insane cases under treatment by no means equals the proportion which this class bears to the whole population. This proportion reaches (making allowance here as elsewhere, in all statistics of population, for children and women living upon the wages of husbands,) somewhat less than 44 per cent., and the proportion of their insane 38 per cent. The farming class furnished 3,789 cases, and the industrial, although employing four or five times less individuals, furnished 6,767, or nearly one-half more. Hence it appears that, in an equal population, the number of laborers and artisans admitted to insane asylums, exceeds, by a large proportion, that of the farmers. This fact agrees with the strongly marked predominance of insane cases which belongs to the population of large cities.

In the class of "servants, day-laborers, &c.," may be reckoned domestics attached to the farm, person or house, and all who are employed for wages in whatever capacity;—*e. g.*, cooks, coachmen, housekeepers, waiters, &c. If our documents are correct, the proportion of insane cases belonging to this category, exceeds the general



average by one-half. This can only be explained by the great number of single persons in this class of those devoted to the indoor service of families, and we have already seen that a majority of all the inmates of asylums are unmarried.

The sixth and last class, entitled, "miscellaneous, and having no occupation," includes beggars, feeble persons, courtezans, children, and in short all persons without any known means of livelihood, or whose occupation is not susceptible of classification. Nearly three-tenths of the insane in France (or 283 in 1,000,) belong to this category.

#### DEGREE OF EDUCATION OF INSANE CASES.

The classification of 32,876 cases, treated in French asylums during 1853, according to the amount of education received previously to their admission, is shown as follows :—

DEGREE OF EDUCATION.	No. of patients, (both sexes.)	Ratio to 100 cases.
Able to read,.....	3,795	11.54
" " " and write,.....	6,447	19.61
More advanced acquirements,.....	2,694	8.20
No instruction, or unknown,.....	19,940	60.65
Totals,.....	32,876	100.00

We have no educational statistics of the whole population, with which to compare these figures, but the table shows that one-fifth of all the patients could read and write at the time of their admission ; one-tenth could read only ; one-twelfth had enjoyed the benefits of a superior education, while more than one-half are set down as having no education whatever, or the facts in their case were unknown.

#### PROBABLE CAUSES OF INSANITY IN THE CASES ADMITTED IN 1853.

The report makes the ordinary triple distinction of causes, viz., predisposing, physical and moral.

An abstract of 19,938 cases, arranged according to sex and probable causes, is found in the following table :—

CAUSES.	Males.	Females.	Both sexes.	Proportion in 1,000
Predisposing causes,.....	1,410	1,473	2,883	144
Physical ".....	5,478	4,286	9,764	490
Moral ".....	3,314	3,977	7,291	366
Totals,.....	10,202	9,736	19,938	1,000

We are doubtless safe in regarding the chief predisposing cause of insanity as hereditary predisposition, and from the above table we may conclude, therefore, that this cause is somewhat more active in the case of females than males. The predominance of physical over moral causes, as given in the table, should be taken with some allowance. It should not be forgotten that physical causes are always more palpable to the eye, and more easily detected, and an apparent physical cause may be sometimes accepted on a hasty observation as the true one, when a further inquiry might demonstrate its fallacy.

Moral causes appear to be more active in the case of females, and physical causes among males. This view, which the table furnishes, seems in the nature of the case to be a just one, and is moreover confirmed by the experience of all specialists. Of 9,764 cases of insanity attributed to physical causes, the report assigns 2,594, or 22 per cent., as the direct consequence of epilepsy or convulsions; 1,502, or 15 per cent., as due to drunkenness, and 923, or 9 per cent., as due to hardship and privation.

The other physical causes are arranged as follows, in the decreasing order of their influence :—

Effects of age, (senile dementia),..	723	Cerebral disturbances,.....	146
Onanism, .....	572	Diseases of skin,.....	126
Venereal excess,.....	296	Syphilis, .....	119
Fevers,.....	283	Excessive labor,.....	115
Cerebral congestion,.....	257	Slow and interrupted develop-	
Suppression of menses,.....	140	ment among young girls,.....	79
Following childbirth,.....	140	Hydrocephalus, .....	69
Blows and injuries,.....	149	Gestation and lactation,*.....	56

\*In this table it is somewhat difficult to determine the purpose in separating the ill effects of "gestation and lactation," from the other accidents "following childbirth." The same may also be said of "cerebral congestions," and "cerebral disturbances."

Of the moral causes of insanity, the Report gives as the most frequent and active, "chagrin following loss of property." 899 cases are set down as due to this cause, or 12 in every 100. After this are reckoned, in decreasing order, the following :—

Religious excitement,.....	894	Excessive intellectual labor,....	156
Love,.....	792	Ordinary imprisonment,.....	54
Violent emotions, (shocks &c.),...	698	Nostalgia, .....	48
Pride,.....	600	Isolation and loneliness,.....	41
Loss of friends,.....	510	Change from active life to one of	
Disappointed ambition,.....	495	leisure, or <i>vice versa</i> ,.....	32
Jealousy,.....	442	Association with the insane,....	16
Political events,.....	308	Solitary imprisonment,.....	4

From these tables it would appear, that, setting aside hereditary predisposition, the most active causes of mental derangement are epilepsy, convulsions, and drunkenness. After these may be reckoned hardships of all kinds, pecuniary loss, and religious excitement, and finally love, old age, violent passions, pride, and onanism. These various causes together constitute nearly one-half the recognized causes of insanity.

#### ADMISSIONS ACCORDING TO THE SEASON OF THE YEAR.

Are not attacks of mental disease more frequent during some months of the year than others? It is scarcely possible to answer this question with certainty or with any scientific accuracy; since, although the attack may occasionally be sudden and well marked, it is more commonly slow in its approach and its progress, and is oftentimes preceded by symptoms which only a professional observer can detect.

Some light, however, is thrown upon the question by the following table. Of 27,413 patients admitted to asylums in 1853, it shows, taking each sex separately, in what month each individual was admitted, and the proportion of the monthly admissions (each month being reckoned at 31 days,) to the total number of admissions, 12,000 :—

MONTHS.	NO. OF ADMISSIONS.			Proportion in 12,000 admissions.
	Males.	Females.	Both sexes.	
January,.....	984	965	1,949	838
February,.....	850	988	1,838	874
March,.....	977	1,023	2,000	859
April,.....	1,075	1,027	2,102	933
May,.....	1,231	1,168	2,399	1,031
June,.....	1,247	1,164	2,411	1,070
July,.....	1,329	1,383	2,712	1,166
August,.....	1,169	1,146	2,315	995
September,.....	1,195	1,233	2,428	1,078
October,.....	1,152	1,269	2,421	1,040
November,.....	1,396	1,167	3,563	1,138
December,.....	1,155	1,120	2,275	978
Total,.....	13,760	13,653	27,413	12,000

Classified according to the four climacteric seasons of the year, we have:—

SEASON.	NO. OF ADMISSIONS.			Proportion in 12,000 admissions.
	Males.	Females.	Both sexes.	
Winter, (Dec. Jan. Feb.).....	2,989	3,073	6,062	2,690
Spring, (Mar. Apr. May.).....	3,283	3,218	6,501	2,823
Summer, (June, July, August.)	3,745	3,693	7,438	3,231
Autumn, (Sep. Oct. Nov.).....	3,743	3,699	7,412	3,256
Totals,.....	13,760	13,653	27,413	12,000

It thus appears that the maximum of admissions occurs in summer and autumn, and that the minimum of admissions belongs to the winter season.

Counting both sexes together, we find that the maximum of admissions is in July; the same is also true of the female sex alone. For males, the maximum is in November. This difference, which has not been noticed hitherto by specialists, requires to be confirmed by future observations.

The minimum of admissions, also, does not fall in the same month for each sex. For males, the minimum is in February, and for females, January. Of the two added together, the minimum falls in January.

## DURATION OF THE DISEASE PREVIOUS TO ADMISSION IN ASYLUMS.

Of the 32,876 insane cases under treatment in 1853, only 14,693 present any data from which we may infer the duration of the disease previous to their admission. Of these the statistics are as follows :—

DURATION TO TIME OF ADMISSION.	Both Sexes.
1 month or less,.....	1,297
1 " to 6,.....	2,569
6 " " 1 year,.....	1,594
1 year to 2 years,.....	1,375
2 years and over,.....	2,446
Since birth,.....	1,888
Indefinite period, short,.....	1,132
" " long,.....	2,392
Total,.....	14,693

To make this table more exact, we should first deduct the 1,888 cases whose disease dates from birth. This will leave 12,805. If for greater convenience this number be represented by 1,000, we find the period of derangement previous to being placed in an asylum, was—

Less than a month for 101 cases.	1 to 2 years for 108 cases.
1 to 6 months " 200 "	More than 2 years for 466 cases.
6 to 12 " " 125 "	

If these statistics be correct, then nearly one-half of all the unfortunates whom we find under treatment in the asylums, are not placed there until more than two years after the invasion of the disease. No wonder, therefore, need be excited by the large number of incurables which encumber our institutions.

## COMPLICATIONS AND AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Insanity is often complicated with paralysis and epilepsy, and this more frequently in the case of males than females. This will be inferred from the following table, which gives for each sex separately, 1st, the number of cases treated in 1853, in which these fearful disorders were noticed as complications ; 2nd, the relative per centage of the two sexes thus affected ; 3rd, the proportion of epileptics and paralytics in a thousand cases under treatment :—



SEX.	CASES OF COMPLICATION.		PER CENT. OF EACH.		PROPORT'N OF EACH IN 1,000 CASES.	
	Paralysis.	Epilepsy.	Paralysis.	Epilepsy.	Paralysis.	Epilepsy.
Males, .....	986	1,462	65.99	57.85	60	88
Females, .....	508	1,065	34.01	42.15	31	64
Both sexes, .....	1,494	2,527	100.00	100.00	45	77

It will be observed that the liability of males to paralysis is nearly twice as great as that of females ; the cases being as 60 to 31. The liability of males to epilepsy, also, is greater than that of females, although less strongly marked, being as 88 to 64.

#### NUMBER OF RELAPSED CASES.

Among the 32,876 cases which form the basis of our statistics, we find 1,635 noted as cases of relapse. This is in the proportion of 49 to 1,000 cases under treatment. Of these relapses, 831 were males, and 804 were females, or in the proportion of 50 to 48 cases in 100. That a relapse is a more frequent occurrence among males, is naturally explained by the greater predisposition of that sex to insanity, which has been already demonstrated. On the other hand, it is well known that in the cases of males, who, as husbands or fathers, are indispensable to the support of their families, physicians having them in charge are humanely prompted to shorten, as much as possible, the term of their separation from home. Thus, oftentimes, their period of convalescence is unwisely curtailed, rendering the liability to relapse, of course, much greater. This circumstance is worthy of consideration in an estimate of this nature. Of 1,395 admissions to the hospitals of Bicêtre and Salpêtrière during the year 1853, 221 were cases of relapse, or in the proportion of 15.84 per cent. Of these 221 relapses, there were—

127 for the 1st time.	5 for the 5th time.
53 " " 2d "	4 " " 6th "
18 " " 3d "	1 " " 10th "
9 " " 4th "	1 even for the 14th.

In more than one-half the cases, the relapse occurs during the first year of their recovery.

## PLACE OF RESIDENCE OF CASES UNDER TREATMENT IN 1853.

If we consider as "city population" that of every commune numbering at least 2,000 inhabitants, and as "rural population" that of all the other communes, we find that the cases treated in 1853 may be divided according to their residence at the time of admission, as follows :—

Living in towns,.....	12,972
" " country,.....	14,536
Residence unknown,.....	5,368
Total,.....	32,876

For the whole population of France, the census of 1851 gives, according to a similar classification,—

Living in cities and towns,.....	8,951,525 or 25½ per cent.
" " country,.....	26,166,114 " 74½ " "
Total,.....	35,117,639

The proportion between the city and rural population being as 1 to 3, the rural districts ought to furnish thrice as many patients as the cities. Now of 1,000 cases admitted in 1853, 472 were from cities and towns, and 528 from the rural districts; from which we may infer, that the patients of city origin are more numerous than those from the country. Several specialists have already noted this fact, and they have generally agreed that among a crowded population, and especially in large cities, the development of luxury, the cultivation of the passions, the agitations, excesses, and various disorders of society, industrial crises with their attendant misfortunes and miseries, etc., are in the highest degree favorable to mental alienation.

We do not know to what extent this opinion, notwithstanding its apparent plausibility, is well founded, but it is not impossible that the predominance of lunatics in cities over the rural districts, may be attributed less to moral and emotional causes than to the restrictions which society is compelled, in a crowded population, to impose upon that unfortunate class. Considerations of public order and safety require that, in cities, all persons deprived of their reason, whatever may be their age and the nature of their affection, should be regard-

ed as dangerous, and therefore placed in confinement by official authority.\*

On the other hand, in the country, where lunatics are generally well known, where they are easily watched, and where their acts cannot, therefore, have the same dangerous consequences to the public peace, the administration leaves to the care of their respective families, those who show themselves to be harmless. Hence we may infer, that if lunatics of rural origin are relatively less numerous among the patients treated in asylums, they would doubtless be found much more numerous among the class of those maintained at home. This is confirmed by the figures of the following table, compiled from the census of 1851 (Vol. XIV. of *Statistique de France*):—

RESIDENCE.	Popula- tion in 1851	No. of Lu- natics maintain'd at home.	Proportion of this class to populat'n.
In 363 chief towns of arrondissements, . . . .	6,406,557	1,856	1 to 3,452
" other towns and communes, . . . . .	29,376,613	22,577	1 to 1,301
Totals, . . . . .	35,783,170	24,433	1 to 1,464

In this table, the classification of lunatics does not exactly correspond with that of lunatics treated in asylums. Yet it cannot be misunderstood that the predominance of the urban element among the cases admitted to asylums, corresponds with the predominance of the rural element among those cases which are maintained at home. Thus the two facts may be regarded as offsetting or compensating for each other.

#### ORIGIN OF LUNATICS UNDER TREATMENT IN 1853.

Among 30,084 cases whose origin has been ascertained, are reckoned 709 foreigners, or 23 to 1,000. Of these there were—

\* "Each prefect is, in the circumscription of his department, the only person charged by and responsible to the police; and consequently he is the only judge of the propriety there may be of allowing an insane person to go at large, or of the necessity of confining him." (Ministerial decisions of Nov. 13, 1846; extract from letter addressed to *M. le Prefet de Seine-et-Marne*.)

Males, .....	421	or 25 to 1,000
Females, .....	288	" 18 " 1,000
Total, .....	709	

Thus the proportion of men among the foreign lunatics, exceeds that of the women by more than one-third. An easy explanation of this difference is the fact that the men are the greater travelers, and of course more liable to be found away from home.

The single department where are found the greatest number of foreign lunatics, is that of the Seine. Of 1,234 patients under treatment in this department in 1853, 187 were of foreign origin, which gives a proportion of 36 per cent. To explain this predominance we have only to remember that the department contains Paris, a city in whose population we should naturally look for a considerable foreign element.

A resumé of the facts under this head furnished by the Report, shows that mental affections are much more frequent among individuals born in those localities in the vicinity of the Seine, and also those which lie in the north-west of France, *i. e.* Bretagne and Normandy, while insanity is much less common among individuals born in the southern departments and the mountainous districts. These observations remain to be confirmed by further investigations on the part of specialists.

In examining the economical condition of those departments having the largest or the least number of lunatics born within their respective limits, we observe that four of the departments most remarkable for their industrial interests, stand at the head of those furnishing the greatest number of cases. These are, Bouches-du-Rhône, Seine, Seine-Inferieure, and Rhône.

(*To be continued.*)

## REPORTS OF AMERICAN ASYLUMS.

1. *Reports of the Trustees and Superintendent of the Maine Insane Hospital.* For year ending November 30, 1859.
2. *Twenty-third Annual Report of the Trustees and Superintendent of the Vermont Asylum for the Insane.* For year ending July 31, 1859.
3. *Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Trustees of the Massachusetts State Lunatic Hospital, at Worcester.* For year ending September 30, 1859.
4. *Sixth Annual Report of the Trustees of the Massachusetts Lunatic Hospital, at Taunton.* For year ending September 30, 1859.
5. *Fourth Annual Report of the Trustees of the Massachusetts State Lunatic Hospital, at Northampton.* For year ending September 30, 1859.
6. *Report of the Board of Trustees of the Massachusetts General Hospital.* For the year 1859.
7. *Reports of the Trustees and Superintendent of the Butler Hospital for the Insane.* For the year 1859.
8. *Sixteenth Annual Report of the Managers of the New York State Lunatic Asylum.* For year ending November 30, 1859.
9. *Report of the state of the New York Hospital and Bloomingdale Asylum.* For the year 1859.
10. *Report of the Resident Physician of the New York City Lunatic Asylum.* For the year 1859.

1. Dr. Harlow's Report is, in the main, an account of a gradual improvement in the economical and sanitary means of the Maine Hospital, and of a continued success in its results. Gas has been introduced throughout the buildings, much to the comfort, as well as to the greater safety, of the patients. A new barn and other out-buildings have been erected, and a reservoir, to contain a hundred hogsheads of water, has been provided, with the view, especially, to a supply in case of accident from fire.



The Report brings down the history of the institution to the close of nineteen years, since its opening. Of 2,127 patients, who have been received for treatment during this time, 890 have been discharged recovered, 369 improved, 383 unimproved, and 267 have died.

The Hospital is at present calculated to provide for 250 patients. At the rate of increase of last year in the number of applications for admission, the next year will find this capacity entirely insufficient. Dr. H. recommends the erection of a second hospital, rather than the further enlargement of the building now occupied.

Of the patients remaining, 52, a less number than last year, were foreigners or non-residents, and received their entire support from the State; and 130 were indigent, receiving aid from the same source. 149 patients have been admitted within the year, and 237 remained at its close. Of the 120 discharged, 58 were recovered, 22 improved, 23 unimproved, and 17 had died.

One of the deaths was from exhaustion following acute mania, two were from dysentery, and one from serous apoplexy. The remaining thirteen were from chronic, incurable maladies.

An unusual exemption from suicide is recorded. None had occurred since 1845, and only two since the opening of the Hospital.

2. The Report of Dr. Rockwell is, as usual, very brief. It notices several recent improvements in the buildings and grounds, among which are the introduction of gas for lighting, and the erection of new workshops and out-buildings.

The general statistics for the year are: Admitted, 156; discharged, 140; remaining, 431. Of those discharged, 67 were recovered, 17 improved, 16 unimproved, and 40 had died.

124, or 29 per cent. of those remaining, derive their support from the State. 54 of those received were sent as "transient insane," or by the courts, or by the directors of the State prison.

3. The twenty-seventh annual Report of the Worcester Hospital, contains a minute account of its operations for the year, and is espe-

cially full in the way of statistics and tabular views. This is as it should be. If statistics of insanity are admitted to be of any real value to mental medicine, or toward the solution of social problems, those supplied by the older institutions, through years of uninterrupted and successful experience, are, certainly, the most worthy of being preserved. Many of the tables in the Report of Dr. Bemis are drawn up with such care, and guarded with such explanation and detail, as to indicate that this fact has been borne in mind in their preparation. Some of them, however, seem to have been given to satisfy an unintelligent curiosity, more than for any other purpose. This is noticeable, especially, in the table of supposed causes of insanity, in those admitted during twenty-seven years. These causes are about one hundred in number, and are arranged in alphabetical order. "Eruptive diseases," "measles," "scarlet fever," "suppressed eruption," "cut foot," "injury," "sore finger," "dog-bite," "tumor," "lightning," and "loss of blood," are examples, to each of which several cases are attributed. The moral agencies are still more unnecessarily refined in their divisions. Grief at loss by death is described in nine varieties, corresponding to the nearness of kindred; as "death of brother," "death of niece," etc. "Uncontrolled passion," "violent temper," "anger," and "great indignation," follow each other in the same connection; and "religious excitement," "religious fanaticism," and "religious perplexity," have separate places in the list. The forms of disease recognized in the whole number of deaths, for the same period, are less objectionable, but some of these would not find a place in the report of a general hospital.

Notwithstanding these obvious faults, the full particulars of the operations of the Hospital for so long a period have a certain interest and value. The ratio of recoveries, forty-five per cent. of the admissions for the past year, though "it has frequently been much greater," is properly considered "quite satisfactory." This success is credited, and no doubt fairly, to the model charity-system of the State, by which liberal and wisely-regulated provision has been made for the insane, and thus their early treatment and its beneficial results very generally obtained. Dr. Bemis says:—

"The preceding table shows that one hundred and nineteen patients were committed to the hospital, whose insanity had existed less than one year. Other tables will show that for a period of twenty-seven years, seventy-five per cent. at least of all patients committed to the hospital who had been insane less than one year, have recovered their mental health and strength. It might also be easily shown that a large majority of those who are committed on the first appearance of insanity are restored during a period of six months.

"Indeed, it is conceded by all, that the early administration of the proper remedies and regimen is of the utmost importance in the care and treatment of the insane. When therefore the disease has commenced, the patient should at once be confided to the care of a hospital designed for the special treatment of his malady."

Two-thirds of those admitted last year were committed by the courts. Of these, and of the methods by which the remainder were placed under treatment, he continues :—

"All those patients who are supported by the charity of the Commonwealth, are necessarily committed by the courts. Many others who possess abundant means for their support, but whose friends prefer a strictly legal process of commitment, are sent to us in the same manner.

"Twenty were committed by the overseers of the poor of the towns in which the patient had a settlement. The towns in such cases assume all the responsibility, and give bonds for the support of the patients while in the hospital. Frequently, however, persons admitted on bonds from overseers of the poor are by no means dependent upon the town for their support. This method of commitment is often chosen because it presents fewer difficulties than any other. The overseers of the poor are, it may be, the patient's neighbors and friends. They know his condition, sympathize with his family, and are ready to offer any assistance in their power.

"Forty-six patients have been admitted during the year whose friends gave bonds for the payment of their expenses.

"There have been committed during the year seventy-one persons who had no settlement in this Commonwealth, thirty-six of whom were males, and thirty-five were females."

317 patients remained at the close of the year, during which 200 had been received. Of the 184 discharged, 89 were recovered, 52 improved, 13 unimproved, and 30 had died.

4. Dr. Choate presents a Report very creditable to him in a pro-  
VOL. XVI. No. 4. N

fessional and literary point of view, and certain to be of interest to the intelligent, general reader.

Upon a consideration of the capacity of the Taunton Hospital, together with the present and prospective wants of the district from which its patients are sent, Dr. C. concludes that no farther increase of facilities for treatment can be afforded. This suggests a question of more or less interest to all similar institutions; that of "the propriety and expediency of any future reception of persons not strictly belonging to the class for which such asylums were founded." This is commented upon as follows:—

"The habit has prevailed with us, as it has with most institutions, of occasionally receiving persons rather for care and safe-keeping than for treatment, who, though not insane, are so addicted to bad habits of life as to be beyond the influence of their friends, or who seem to have lost in a measure their self-control. Some of these, knowing their own want of power to govern themselves, have voluntarily and eagerly placed themselves in our charge, anxious to be so situated that temptation cannot reach them. Others have been placed here by their parents, their husbands, or their children. Needing, as this class obviously do, some such means of restraint and treatment as are afforded in a public institution, they can hardly be considered as coming within the definition of such as the hospital for the insane was designed for. However much charity may incline us to look upon intemperance, or unbridled licentiousness, or proneness to any form of vice as disease, it may well be doubted whether we are assisting the cause of virtue by so doing, although we may, in each particular case, be subserving a good end by relieving the anxious feelings of relatives, and affording an opportunity for reflection to the victim of unfortunate practices. The application of the term moral insanity, to such cases, has been the source already of much injury to the community, and of a confusion in our ideas of what is disease and what crime. That the term should never be applied to cases of mere vicious tendencies and habits, however strong and uncontrollable, unless accompanied by evident disturbance of the intellectual faculties, is a conclusion to which the opinions of most men who have made mental disease the study of their lives, are gradually, but surely tending. All vice and crime must be considered as the result of moral disease; but it is a disease of the heart rather than of the head, and should not, simply on account of its intensity and excess, be classed with a different species of malady."

We entirely agree with Dr. Choate, both in regard to the psycho-

logical distinction between disease and vice, and in his practical view of the subject. It may be thought, indeed, that society can not be brought to look with a proper charity upon its guilty members, except through the admission of a "moral insanity." But this plea has now no practical force, and, as in all cases in which truth is bent to serve even a laudable purpose, the end is further than before from being attained. If, then, we cannot repress the lower, punitive instincts, excited in community at the view of guilty actions, by shifting the true line of demarkation between disease and drunkenness, we shall only deceive ourselves in supposing the sentiment by which these instincts were to be supplanted more worthy the name of charity. Let us remember, too, that the best experience confirms the opinion that, even where moral depravation is most manifestly connected with physical disorder, all the restorative influences we can bring to bear through the mind of the patient, should be the same in kind as those which an enlightened charity would prescribe in cases of unmixed wickedness. This, it seems to us, is the view of the subject to be urged upon those who, by their character or official position, determine the policy of our charitable and reformatory institutions.

Another matter touched upon in the Report, is that of the actual and comparative number of cures effected at the institution. In estimating what should be considered a satisfactory result in this particular, we are properly reminded that at the opening of the Hospital, seven years ago, "211 patients, nearly all of whom were chronic cases, were received from another hospital." Another class of facts, leading us to look for favorable results from treatment, have been alluded to in noticing the Worcester Hospital Report; viz., the small extent of the district from which patients are drawn, the comparative sufficiency of accommodation for the insane of the State, and the excellence, in all respects, of the system under which they are committed and maintained. The results of the comparison show a slight excess in favor of the Taunton Hospital over the average cures of some dozen other institutions, British and American, which are presented. Of course, no positive conclusions are drawn from this. With our present knowledge of the treatment of mental disease, and



under the numberless difficulties in the way of its application, if these results are of any value, it is only to describe the field occupied by an institution, in the class of cases which it receives.

Dr. C. calls attention to a difficulty in the administration of the Hospital, which is, perhaps, more seriously felt than any other in our modern institutions, and which, with him, we consider worthy of much sacrifice to remedy. This evil is that of a deficient means of classification. He remarks :—

“Three classes of patients only of each sex can be made without some decided alteration in the present arrangement of the building. This is much less than is now considered indispensable in a well arranged modern hospital. The advantages of a thorough classification, and its bearing not only upon the comfort of the inmates and the easy management of the institution, but actually upon its curative results, it is unnecessary that I should dwell upon at any length. The quiet of the whole household, the prevention of irritating influence upon one another, the avoidance of unpleasant collisions, the more perfect supervision of each individual case, the avoidance as far as practicable of mechanical restraint and seclusion, all depend in a great degree upon the means possessed of suitable divisions, and of placing together those and those only who shall not only exercise no injurious influences upon each other, but who shall actually co-operate and aid in each other's recovery. Notwithstanding the original unfortunate construction of the building in this particular, the evil might still be to a considerable extent remedied, and at no very great cost, by introducing a few new partitions and new dining-rooms, a change to which I would respectfully ask your attention.”

We should be glad to quote from the general remarks concluding this able Report, what we think a full and candid examination of the subject of mechanical restraint. It must suffice to say, however, that the use of certain forms of restraint, as the camisole and the like, are shown to be decidedly preferable to seclusion, to the hands of attendants, and to depressing agents. The latter class of means is especially denounced, as injurious and liable to the most flagrant abuses.

231 patients had been admitted and 191 discharged ; leaving 341 under treatment at the close of the year. Of those discharged, 98 were recovered, 22 improved, 29 unimproved, and 42 had died.

5. The fourth annual Report of the Hospital at Northampton, is dated one year and six weeks after the opening of the institution for patients. Dr. Prince is able to say, that—

“A kind Providence has brought us through that most trying period in the history of a new institution, its first year, without accident to detract from the gratification with which we may look upon its results, and has crowned our efforts with a measure of success highly satisfactory.”

Of the Hospital building and its economical details, a year's experience has been generally most favorable. Dr. P. continues :—

“A year's experience shows the adaptation of the building and the various fixtures and apparatus to the ends for which they were designed. Their completeness not only leaves comparatively little to be desired, in addition, but experience in their use assures us that no very important alterations or repairs can be necessary for many years to come, to render them and to keep them in every respect equal to the demands of an enlightened philanthropy.”

A partial exception to this, is the insufficiency of the heating apparatus—steam-piping in basement chambers—during periods of extreme cold ; but an easy remedy is suggested for the fault. The ventilation, by means of a fan, is highly satisfactory.

There were remaining at the date of the Report, 233 patients. 93 had been admitted, and 80 discharged. Of the latter, 33 were recovered, 18 improved, 10 unimproved, and 19 had died.

6. The Report of Dr. Tyler is almost wholly devoted to a statement of the popular aspects of the subject of mental disease, in its causation, prevention, and treatment. This is done so fully and so clearly as to meet most of the numerous difficulties which are constantly present in the popular mind, to prevent a judicious and consistent course in the treatment of insanity. There is, naturally, a tendency in such remarks to lay greater stress upon certain considerations than would be proper for the professional reader. An instance of this is where, in enforcing the fact of the great curability of insanity, he says :—

“I apprehend that a false impression exists concerning the bearing

of hereditary influence upon the curability of insanity. It is beyond question that persons whose parents or grandparents have been insane are more liable to an attack than are others, just as those persons are more liable to fevers, or rheumatism, or scrofula, whose ancestry have had the same. But we do not on this account consider that their fevers or their rheumatism are any the less curable. Nor in any case of insanity is the probability of a cure qualified by the simple fact of hereditary transmission, though it is of course qualified by the particular form of disease transmitted."

Are we mistaken in supposing that scrofula, rheumatism, and many other forms of disease, are less amenable to treatment in cases which have a remote and constitutional origin, than in those whose causes are more immediate and accidental? That a paroxysm of mania or melancholia is quite as likely to be convalesced from in a case of transmitted taint as in one free from such predisposition, is perhaps true. But one of the first hints toward the prognosis of insanity derived from experience in its treatment, and one of the plainest inductions from statistics, is, that the probabilities of a complete and permanent recovery are greatly lessened by the fact of heredity. Perhaps we shall be justified in finding a meaning favorable to this view in the rather obscure last sentence of the part quoted.

A more serious error than the above, it seem to us, is contained in the following paragraph:—

"Intemperance stands at the head of the list of specific physical causes in the statistics of insanity, and there is at present a fearful increase of this vice among our young men. The directness with which alcoholic stimulus affects the brain is well known. Sometimes this primary condition does not pass away, but remaining permanently, is insanity. Oftener, however, by repeated overstimulation, which at first is entirely within a person's control, but afterwards grows easily into the necessity of a habit, the brain is weakened, and by the poisonous presence of alcohol, is damaged irremediably, and the person becomes possessed by some fixed delusion, incapacitating him for business and for social life, or slowly and certainly sinks into dementia or fatuity. But more melancholy than the physical decay, is the moral debasement which progresses in equal step therewith. By the usual insidious path of indulgence, the miserable state of a delirious drunkard is reached, every step in which is a move of intense selfishness and of disregard for the tenderest ties of life; every step is a triumph of an animal appetite over conscience, and every

step tends to the thorough demoralization of the whole man; and often before the inebriate has reached the irresponsible condition of insanity, he has become the incarnation of selfishness, falsehood, and ingratitude. Occasionally we meet with a person who, after some great calamity or grievous sorrow, or after a serious illness, becomes periodically intoxicated, and who without question may be called "a dipsomaniac," whose inebriety is not the result of a yielding to appetite, but of an uncontrollable impulse, and whose moral feelings are all unimpaired and undebased, and whose condition is to himself a subject of most bitter and unaffected grief and regret."

A more truthful and forcible sketch of the effects of intemperance in the production of insanity than is given in the first part of these remarks, need not be desired. But we must protest here, as elsewhere, against the use of the term "dipsomaniac," and against the admission that, with the intellect and moral feelings "unimpaired," and under the plea of an "uncontrollable impulse," a man may avoid the proper responsibility for his actions. It is surely enough that the self-deception of the inebriate should be so complete as it often is, without leaving him helpless in the effort for reform, through finding that his own delusion is partaken of by all around him.

175 patients remained at the date of the Report, and 131 had been admitted within the year. 142 were discharged during the same period, of whom 61 were recovered, 36 improved, 17 unimproved, and 28 had died.

7. At the head of an institution small in size, yet sufficient for the wants of the community from which its patients are received, ample in its pecuniary resources, finished in its construction, and complete in all the essentials to its successful operation, Dr. Ray is called, in his Report, to dwell upon few of those topics which form the yearly burden of most similar documents. For this reason it is his custom to give instead, a popular, or at least a practical, essay upon some subject more or less connected with the specialty. The false theories and practical evils of our present educational systems have been demonstrated, in some of his later Reports, in such a manner as to awaken a marked interest upon the subject among the profession and the community. He has made use of the present occasion to give his

views upon a special aspect of the same general subject, of mental and moral training. Attention is called to "certain laws of the brain and nervous system, and the effect of their observance or infringement upon the mental health." The psychical law which the writer proceeds to notice, is recognized under the common names of sympathy, and propensity to imitation; the latter being dependent upon, and a manifestation of the former. Of the primary importance of this principle in the development of the individual and of society, he writes as follows:—

"It needs no profound knowledge of the springs of human action to perceive that every man's daily experience reveals, in some way or other, the operation of this law of our nature. Indeed, it can hardly be questioned, that, in populous communities, it determines, more than anything else, not only those great social movements which possess an historical importance, but also the sentiments and impulses which, for good or for ill, shape the views and conduct of the individual. Independent, self-originating movement is, probably, a far rarer thing than that which springs, more or less directly, from some outward and distant source. The character of the latter, in any individual, must obviously be determined, therefore, by the character of the movements immediately around him. If these are characterized by disordered imagination, by groveling propensities, by unhallowed desires, they will never in their course rise higher than their original source. By an irresistible and inevitable law, they impart their own moral complexion to whatever they involve in their progress. The teachings of the school and the church, and the precepts of philosophy have much to do, no doubt, with shaping the character and conduct of men; but the thoughts, emotions and impulses, awakened by the mental movements around them, are often the efficient forces that determine the great events of life. To learn, therefore, what a man will do in a given social emergency, we must look, not only to his special training and the prominent qualities of his character, but also to the currents of feeling in which he is moving, and the tone of thought which prevails around him."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Nearly related to this law of sympathy, and perhaps only another form of it, is the propensity to imitate, which is witnessed in every kind of mental temperament and every grade of mental culture. We say and do what others say and do, and often for no other reason. Indeed, so completely is this propensity independent of reason, that it is exercised automatically, and without reference to the quality of the object. Especially is it active among those who are



laboring under excessive nervous irritability, or some other abnormal condition of the nervous system. Even muscular movements, which would seem, at first thought, to be exclusively under the control of the will, are often propagated in this manner, with a degree of force and continuance which no effort of the will could reach."

This law is further illustrated by reference to the phenomena of chorea, hysteria, and epidemics of suicide, homicide, and religious fanaticism. Even the preliminary aberrations of mania are under the control of the same law, Dr. Ray believes, to a great degree.

The practical direction of his remarks points to the newspaper press, and to novels, as principal sources of these morbid manifestations, in the most highly civilized communities. Of the former he says :—

"It is a common impression that the newspaper merely ministers to the natural curiosity of men to know what is passing around them ; but it has another and a far more important effect. It is not every occurrence whose communication to the world can be productive of unmingled good. For reasons just given, no small proportion of those which are thrust upon the reader's attention, leave a positively unhealthy impression ; and when we consider that, besides the multitudes who, in addition to other reading, never pass a day without looking over a newspaper, there is a scarcely smaller number who read nothing else, we get some faint idea of the magnitude of this result. The details of vice and crime which occupy so large a space in the daily sheet, repeated day after day, familiarize the mind with their hideous features and thus blunt the edge of its finer sensibilities. The effect of it all is, that the mind not only becomes careless of moral distinctions, but incapable, in some degree, of perceiving them ; its relish for the simply good and beautiful and true, is lost, and in its place we find an insatiable craving for what will create a strong sensation, and a positive sympathy, perhaps, with wrong and wrong-doers."

Novels, especially those of the "sensation kind," now so much more read than the superior fictions of another class and age, are also pronounced the source of great mischief to society, through the mental irregularities which they induce, under the laws of sympathy and imitation.

"The remedy," he says, "is higher culture, and nobler aims. It consists not in blaming the people connected with the press, or addressing to them philosophical reflections on the operations of the

mind, but in refining and elevating the public taste, by improving our methods of education, and multiplying the means and appliances of a higher and sounder cultivation. This, certainly, is not very specific, and promises no immediate relief; but so it ever must be with all reforms that affect the exercise of the passions and propensities."

The general statistics of the Hospital for the year, are: Remaining at date of Report, 135; admitted and discharged, each 42; recovered 14, improved 16, unimproved 2, died 10.

8. The Asylum at Utica contained 519 patients at the end of the year, during which 312 had been admitted, and 295 discharged. Of the latter 114 were recovered, 57 improved, 86 unimproved, 3 not insane, and 35 had died.

"The past," says Dr. Gray, "has been a year of general prosperity. The Institution has been constantly crowded, the daily average being 509, which is 36 above that of any previous year. The erection of the out-buildings for carpenter, paint, tailor, and smith shops, printing office, and washing and laundry purposes, during the past four years, has enabled us, from year to year, to extend the accommodations of the Institution, by gradually re-arranging a part of the second-story rear wing, (formerly used for shops, &c.,) and converting it into sleeping wards for patients. We have now, however, reached the fullest capacity of the buildings, and cannot expect, nor would it be wise, to extend the arrangements for more than the present number of patients.

"It will be observed that we have received an average of one patient for every week-day throughout the year, and yet we have been compelled to refuse pressing applications from all parts of this, and from other States. We have also been obliged, as in former years, to send home to the care of friends, and to the receptacles connected with the county-houses, a number of patients as unimproved. Of the 86 thus discharged, 34 were quiet, harmless, and easily cared for in their families; 13 were incurable, and were removed to institutions in this or other States, for permanent custodial care; 9 whose friends were unable longer to meet their expenses, were removed in order to be taken care of in rooms especially arranged for them in their houses; 30 were more or less demented, though apt sometimes to be noisy and destructive, and therefore difficult of care in county receptacles, where the means of moral and even medical care are generally very inadequate. Indeed such cases are usually confined in small rooms, and not unfrequently chained and manacled, other

restraint not being deemed sufficient to prevent them from destroying their clothing, and demolishing the wooden, or lath and plaster walls generally adopted in such cheap structures.

"While many of these cases would have further improved by protracted treatment, the great majority were incurable. Among the more hopeless of recovery were those who remained more or less violent, and yet were necessarily removed to make room for recent cases, still more difficult of care, and who were in the stages of disease offering the best hopes of restoration.

"Many of those heretofore sent away as incurable have been returned, the circumstances surrounding them among their friends, or at the county-houses, exciting their violent propensities, and rendering them eminently dangerous, except under the discipline of an organized institution."

The urgent necessity thus indicated of further provision for the insane of this State, has been so frequently, for so long a time, and from so many different directions, pressed upon the notice of the legislature that a total neglect to meet its demands has become discreditable in the highest degree. The lack of any well considered theory and any definite policy, in the administration of great public charities, is also as unworthy the intelligence of a community, as the sad results are a reproach to its generosity and christian sympathy.

A useful and interesting feature of this Report, is the minute analysis of the cases of death during the year. In connection with the well arranged tables, this exhibits the large number of acute and gravely complicated cases of mental disease, necessarily received, to the exclusion of those less severe, from a district including nearly the whole of a great State.

The subject of the employment and amusement of patients is commented upon as follows :—

"Among the means of moral and hygienic treatment for the insane, appropriate employment is deservedly held to be of the first importance. Whether, indeed, this class of means should be directed mainly to the discipline or to the diversion of patients must greatly depend upon circumstances, which vary with different institutions. The true theory of a public asylum is generally acknowledged to be, that it shall retain under its care all the insane of the community, except, perhaps, those so far demented that there is no possibility of their becoming again maniacal, or even exhibiting any paroxysms of excitement. In an asylum constituted upon something like this plan,

having a large proportion of its cases those of the various forms of chronic mania, a system of regulated labor and mental and moral discipline would be properly, and with much advantage, carried out. But these institutions have not yet attained their true place in the practical working of public charity and public policy. Various causes have given public asylums a tendency to become chiefly curative, or merely custodial institutions. Thus, in an asylum like this, from which chronic cases are, by a stern necessity, constantly being crowded out, and whose means must greatly resemble those of a general hospital, it is not practicable to introduce any system of compulsory employment; it is nevertheless true, as the reports of the steward and matron show, that, during the past, as well as in former years, a large amount of voluntary labor has been performed by patients, and we believe much to their gratification, as well as improvement. Among the few unqualified advantages of a very large institution, is the necessity for organizing and keeping up all the ordinary trades and occupations. Under the care of experienced workmen, the patient may thus occupy himself in his accustomed manner, during a period of his convalescence when unwonted labor would be distasteful, or call for so much mental effort as rather to injure than benefit him. The extensive farm and garden, besides giving ample employment to the farming class, also require a large amount of unskilled labor, and furnish an agreeable diversity of occupation for all."

9. 152 patients remained under treatment in the Bloomingdale Asylum at the date of the last Report. 138 had been admitted and 131 discharged, during the year. Of the latter, 55 were recovered, 32 improved, 26 unimproved, and 18 had died.

Of the improvements made in the Asylum, during the past year, and their happy effects, the Governors remark :—

"The additional buildings have made the in-door accommodations such as to justify the expectations of this Board and their Medical Officer.

"Quiet and sensitive patients have been relieved of the annoying presence of the disorderly and noisy; and thus the latter have been permitted a degree of liberty formerly incompatible with the comfort of their associates.

"The increase of female patients in the present year, however, seems to require such extension of their apartments as may give as much room for classification as has hitherto been at the command of the Physician.

"The large central stone edifice originally erected in 1820, and

for some years the only Asylum building, being now freed from the inconveniences of containing very discordant classes of patients, presents peculiar advantages to quiet or convalescent patients, for whose use it is now applied. The introduction of gas throughout the establishment, has added to its comfort and cheerfulness."

10. The Report of the New York City Lunatic Asylum shows a continued increase in the number of patients committed to its care. The daily average population for the past year was 688, 28 larger than for the year previous. This has crowded the Asylum beyond the possibility of proper care for all its patients.

"Besides the inmates of this Institution," says Dr. Ranney, "there are, at least, 200 insane persons in the other Department of the Island. Their number is increasing with such rapidity, year by year, that it seems necessary to collect definite facts to show the reasons of this result, and at some future day, I propose to present to you a communication on this subject."

It had been decided to erect a new building in connection with the Asylum within the coming season, and Dr. R. urges the adoption in this of the most approved features of modern asylums, in respect to sanitary and economical arrangements, means for classification, heating, ventilating, lighting, &c. He refers, in this connection, to the noble example of a neighboring State, and pays an appropriate compliment to one of its most distinguished physicians and citizens, as follows:—

"Massachusetts has taken the lead in this particular, and the asylum recently erected at Northampton, will compare favorably with any in the world. Much of the progress in this country is due to Dr. Bell, who has given especial attention to the subject. Having been the Medical Superintendent of the McLean Asylum for many years, and having visited all the institutions of note in Europe, with the object of combining that which was valuable in each, his views and suggestions would be entitled to careful consideration."

There were remaining at the date of the Report, 711 patients. 389 had been admitted and 333 discharged, during the year. Of the latter, 148 were recovered, 68 improved, 31 unimproved, and 86 had died.



*Clinical Lectures on certain Acute Diseases.* By ROBERT BENTLEY TODD, M. D., F. R. S., formerly Physician, now Consulting Physician to King's College Hospital, London. London, 1859.

THE subjects treated in this small but able and interesting work, are, "rheumatic fever," "continued fever," "erysipelas," "erysipelas of the fauces," "acute internal inflammations," "pyemia," "pneumonia and its complications," and "the therapeutical action of alcohol." The selections we are about to make, as coming within the scope of this journal, relate principally to the use of alcohol.

Our first extract is from Lect. III. :—

"There is a very formidable complication of rheumatic fever, respecting which I must say a few words. I allude to the delirium which is apt to manifest itself in the course of the attack; sometimes with thoracic inflammation, sometimes without it. It is very important that you should be prepared for this symptom, and that you should understand its nature, and its proper mode of treatment. It is not in itself a dangerous symptom, unless the practitioner fails in taking the precautions which are rendered imperative by its occurrence.

"The delirium of rheumatic fever sometimes comes on gradually, the patient having been a little talkative and wandering for two or three nights; sometimes it comes on quite suddenly. In its general characters it resembles delirium tremens—generally, however, exhibiting less of the nervous tremor which belongs to intemperance. The patient is restless, busy, talkative, picking or pulling the bed-clothes, frequently rising in bed, and wanting to get out of bed, reaching out his hand as if to catch hold of some object before or behind him, and sometimes—a most unfortunate symptom—obstinately refusing to take either food or medicine.

"In many instances, as I have already said, this delirium ushers in pericarditis, pleurisy, or pneumonia. Frequently, however, it occurs after one or other of these maladies has set in, and sometimes it occurs without them. It has, therefore, I think, no necessary connection with these internal inflammations, although it frequently accompanies them.

"Now what is the nature of this delirium? It used formerly to be viewed as a metastasis of rheumatism to the brain, and to be treated antiphlogistically. I have treated some cases in this way,

and on this hypothesis, and I have had the opportunity, in consequence, I believe, of this treatment, of examining the state of the contents of the cranium in a few such cases. I can, therefore, assure you that there is no more inflammation, either of the brain or its membranes, in these cases, than in delirium tremens. The membranes are perfectly free from abnormal deposit, the pia mater is pale, the grey matter of the convolutions is remarkably so, and the sub-arachnoid fluid is increased in quantity. These signs indicate not only that the brain has been imperfectly supplied with blood during life, but that the vascular pressure upon it is less than it ought to be, and that, consequently, an increase of the sub-arachnoid fluid has taken place.

"When then we consider the circumstances in which the brain is placed in these cases, we cannot wonder at its functions being disturbed. In the first place the organ is supplied by a depraved blood—a blood deficient in its most important staminal principal, its coloring matter; a blood infected with an abnormal material, the rheumatic virus, whatever that may be; and a watery blood, which is the more apt to exist if the patient, as is very often the case, have been treated with sanguineous depletions. Such a blood is ill-suited for the proper stimulation of the heart, and, consequently, it is not propelled by that organ with its proper force, although the rapidity of the heart's action may be much increased; and if the heart be inflamed, there can be no doubt that the offset of this inflammation will be to weaken still more the propelling power. Hence, in cases of this kind, the brain is feebly furnished with a blood, poisoned, poor in coloring matter, and abounding in water."

\* \* \* \* \*

"The development of this delirium should not only warn the practitioner to look out for cardiac, or other internal inflammation, it should likewise be regarded as a signal of distress, denoting that the powers of the constitution are unequal to the severe trial through which the patient is passing; and he should come immediately to the patient's aid, and arrange to have him constantly watched by competent nurses, taking care that the patient shall never be left alone. If he have been sweating freely, that must be checked; the amount of bed-clothes may be reduced, and if his joints have been enveloped in wool, the wool must be removed. In like manner any other too free evacuation must be stopped, as purging, or the too copious discharges of a blister. Nourishment must be given very frequently, but in small quantities, so as not to embarrass the stomach; and this should consist of beef-tea, arrow-root, milk; and it will be always necessary to conjoin with this wine or brandy, or porter, (when that has been the habitual beverage,) and these should be given in small and carefully adjusted quantities. If the patient be wakeful, sleep must be procured by the free administration of opium. \* \* \*

Provide against your patient being allowed to exert himself beyond his strength. Remember that it is in this state that patients often die suddenly of syncope, and be careful to nourish and support them well. Eschew all local treatment to the head; even the application of ice is calculated to do mischief, by depression of the heart's action."

In Lecture V., on continued fever, we find the following remarks:—

"Of the cerebral symptoms, delirium, coma, and convulsions, two of which at least are of frequent occurrence in continued fever, I can only repeat what I said when speaking of the same symptoms in my lectures on rheumatic fever—that we have no grounds at all for supposing them due to any inflammatory or congested condition of the brain or its membranes, but must rather consider them as the result of that perverted nutrition which is the necessary consequence of the poisoned condition of the nutrient fluid.

"With respect to the treatment of these symptoms, what I said in speaking of the treatment in pulmonary complications is applicable here also; you must treat them as part of the general disorder, not as distinct diseases. An increase of these symptoms, especially of the delirium, usually indicates an increasing exhaustion, and therefore demands a larger degree of stimulants."

Again, in Lecture VI., on erysipelas, he says:—

"In a third class of cases, the patients die delirious or comatose. When this occurs, some authors will tell you that the erysipelas has induced inflammation of the membranes of the brain. These notions are now, however, almost entirely exploded, and there is ample evidence that if death takes place while the patient is in either of these conditions, the cerebral meninges are found, upon post-mortem examination, to be perfectly healthy. Nor can any of the products of an inflammatory process be detected; or if there be any thing amiss with them, it is that the vessels of the pia mater contain rather less blood than they ought to do. These formidable symptoms are rather to be attributed to the circulation of a noxious blood through the brain, and to a consequent defective and depraved nutrition of that organ, than to inflammation and its products."

After stating that his treatment of erysipelas, approved and confirmed by many years' practice, is the supporting plan, to wit, the free administration of food and stimulants, such as beef-tea and some form of alcohol (brandy is preferred) in precisely regulated quantities, at stated and short intervals, and if drugs are needed, ammonia, bark, and chloric ether, avoiding to give two different forms of food or stimulant at the same time,—Dr. Todd proceeds to say:—

" Sometimes, in the course of an attack of erysipelas, the patient may become delirious, or he may fall into a state of coma. It is during the first fourteen days of the disease, that these formidable symptoms are most apt to occur. Hence the necessity of beginning early, from the first, with support and stimulants, which you will find preventive both of delirium and coma. The lower you keep your patient, the greater will be the tendency to delirium and coma, and the more violent or profound will either be; and the development of either is an indication for pressing the treatment in the same or greater doses. Sometimes you will find that the coma persists, notwithstanding all the support you can give; and then you may generally conclude with certainty, that the blood has become poisoned by pus, or some other morbid agent, and that death from pyæmia is about to occur; or that local formations of pus are about to be developed in various parts of the body."

\* \* \* \* \*

" Sometimes, through feeble powers of digestion in the patient, or injudicious zeal on the part of the attendants, you may find that you are over-stimulating. What are the indications of this? They show themselves in sickness, in flatulence, in a sense of oppression, perhaps also in a derangement of the bowels. When such symptoms occur, nothing can be easier than to suspend the treatment for a few hours, to give only a little cold water, and afterwards to resume it cautiously in diminished quantities."

Dr. Todd dwells with special earnestness on the importance of adopting the stimulating treatment of erysipelas, at the very beginning of the attack. He reminds his pupils that the poison of erysipelas is exceedingly depressing in its action—one of the most lowering and debilitating diseases to which the human frame is liable. Accordingly, the first aim should be to antagonize the poison, and the second, to uphold the patient's powers. Of all the stimulants, he believes the alcoholic to be the best. So remarkable are the effects which in a great variety of cases he has seen to result from the free exhibition of this remedy, that he is inclined to regard it as an antidote to the erysipelatous poison. "If," says he, "I am to be restricted to any one remedy in the treatment of this disease, I should assuredly choose brandy. With a commissariat well supplied with brandy, and simple means to keep the bowels open, I think I could engage to keep erysipelas at a minimum amongst the wounded in our army in the Crimea."

Our next selection is from Lecture VIII., on acute inflammations:—

"Many people start with horror at the notion of giving alcohol in acute inflammatory disease. What! give brandy in inflammation of the lungs! it is only adding fuel to the fire, and cannot fail to keep up or to increase the morbid process.

"Those who reason in this way take a narrow, and I must say, an incorrect view, both of the morbid process and of the healing process. They are led away by the name 'inflammation,' which is likened in their imagination to an internal conflagration, to be quenched by some summary means, or to be starved out. Nothing is to be given but what is, in popular phrase, cooling; and blood, the great pabulum of animal heat is especially to be diverted from the seat of inflammation, or to be abstracted in such ways as the peculiarities of the case will admit.

"This reasoning is of the most purely fanciful kind. It rests upon a very imperfect view of the phenomena, both local and constitutional, which accompany the inflammatory process. In fact, it takes into account only two of the phenomena of this process; namely, the heat, and the afflux of blood, leaving out of consideration both the exciting cause and the proximate cause of this heat and afflux of blood." \* \* \*

"Inflammation is a deranged nutrition. Like the normal nutrition, it involves supply and waste, and, as the latter is considerable, the former will be proportionably needed. The tendency in inflammation is to the more or less rapid formation of abnormal products, such as lymph and pus; and the supplies for these formations must be drawn from the blood or from the tissues, in both cases, with the effect of more or less exhaustion of vital force, and in the latter, with organic disintegration more or less extensive. The active chemical process which accompanies all these changes, engenders the great heat of the inflamed part.

"The more this process of inflammation draws upon the blood, the greater will be the exhaustion of vital force, and the more the whole frame will suffer; the more it feeds on the tissues, the greater will be the difficulty of the reparatory process. Is it not, then, important that adequate supplies be conveyed to this process, abnormal though it be? And in what other way can such supplies be conveyed, than through the blood, so that the waste of tissue may be stopped, and the tendency to abnormal formations be checked, at least in that direction?

"And this, in truth, seems to me the plain and simple fact: You must feed inflammation as you would feed other active, vital processes. You must feed them, that is, to prevent them from extending to and preying upon healthy organic structures. Bear in mind too, that you cannot stop an inflammation so long as the exciting cause



of irritation is inherent in the inflamed part. You cannot cure an inflamed eye, so long as the irritating particle of dust remains adherent to it. It is wise policy, then, to try and gain time, until by antidotal means, or by elimination, you can get rid of the local irritation, whatever that may be.

"The physiological expression for what is commonly called *suppuration*, is a more or less rapid waste of tissue, or organic matter, and a conversion of the particles so wasted into what we designate *pus*. This conversion will, within certain limits, take place in greater quantity, and the more actively, the lower the vital power of the patient. Take two cases of erysipelas, involving the same parts, and in all respects alike, and place them in adjoining beds. Feed one from the beginning of the symptoms, and give him stimulants—give the other milk and beef-tea; both patients will get well, but the first will have few or no secondary abscesses, while the second will have them in greater or less number, as he has naturally more or less power of vital resistance." \* \* \*

"Your supplies should always be administered in small quantities, more or less frequently repeated. They should be well-timed, and the exact doses defined. When alcohol is administered largely, animal food is best given in solution, as in broths or soups. The ability of the patient to take solid animal food may be regarded as the signal for diminishing the supplies of alcohol."

Dr. Todd alludes to the circumstance that a flushed face often follows the first use of stimulants, and charges the practitioner not to be alarmed or dissuaded by this. The flush does no harm, and will generally disappear under more minute but more frequent doses. To make stimulants answer the purpose, use them early, carefully, watchfully, in exact quantities, and with no timid or vascillating spirit. He says:—

"They are agents of inestimable value for saving life under all forms of acute disease, and I can say with truth, from a large experience, that the harm which they do (in disease) is grossly and unfairly exaggerated, and always due to the slovenly administration of them. The opponents of their use argue from their outrageous abuse in health, against their careful and scientific use in disease, forgetting how essentially different must be the effect of sixteen or twenty ounces of wine swallowed within an hour or two, along with other food, and the same quantity carefully distributed in half-ounce and ounce doses over a period of twenty-four hours. I say it, after mature reflection, and a long course of observation, that there is no point of therapeutics so deserving of the study of the earnest-minded physician

or surgeon, who is zealous to save life, as that of the action of these agents, both in health and disease."

We conclude these extracts with one passage more. It occurs in Lecture XIV., "On the Therapeutical action of Alcohol."

"The early administration of alcohol in the manner I have recommended, exercises a most remarkable and unequivocal influence in preventing or materially limiting the intensity of delirium. Delirium is a symptom of enfeebled and contaminated nutrition of the brain. It is to be looked for in all exhausting diseases, and in all acute maladies accompanied by high fever. You meet with it in the acute internal diseases, in the exanthemata, in erysipelas, in typhus and typhoid, in the rheumatic and gouty fevers, and after severe burns, or compound fractures, or great surgical operations, after parturition, and in profuse hemorrhage from whatever cause. In all such cases, the timely administration of alcohol will *prevent* or mitigate the delirium, and will check it if it have come on early. It is also applicable to the treatment of delirium of the hysterical and epileptic types, although in such cases it will not be found to tell with such marked effect as in the delirium which accompanies acute disease."

The concluding remarks of this Lecture are of great interest and importance, but must be left for another time.

---

## S U M M A R Y .

---

THE CASE OF PATRICK MAUDE, EXECUTED FOR THE MURDER OF HIS SISTER, AT NEWARK, N. J.—No case has lately come to our notice involving so important points in the medico-legal relations of homicide and insanity, as that of Maude, and we have anticipated with much interest the publication of a full report of the trial. In this we have been disappointed, and can, therefore, give only a general outline of the facts and conclusions, as they are before the public.

Maude was a superior laborer in a manufactory, forty-five years old, of Irish birth, but not of the lowest class of his countrymen.

He had only a rudimentary education, but possessed rare natural gifts, of quickness of perception, memory, and reasoning powers. By the irregular cultivation of these, however, and through a violent temper and a vicious disposition, he grew very erratic and morose. This was also aggravated by habits of drinking to excess, and he finally became extremely jealous and vindictive in his character, and reckless and violent in his conduct.

Through jealousy of his wife, and also on account of some pecuniary troubles between them, in April, 1858, he attempted to shoot her, and soon after made a similar attack upon a neighbor. For these he was tried and convicted, but his behavior upon the trial was such that a medical investigation, ordered by the court, resulted in the unanimous opinion that he was insane. He was then sent to the Lunatic Asylum, at Trenton, whence he shortly escaped, and, two days afterwards, deliberately killed his sister by firing two pistol-shots into her breast. He had before freely avowed his purpose to take her life and the lives of others, in revenge for their conduct towards him.

The plea of insanity was interposed by counsel, upon his trial before the same court which had ordered his confinement as an insane person. No evidence of any loss of intellectual power appears to have been offered. On the contrary, during the trial he excited the wonder of all who saw him by its display. But it was shown that, both before and after the homicide, he had manifested *insane delusions*, and we do not find any serious attempt, on the part of the prosecution, to disprove the fact, or to sustain any theory of feigning, or of lucid intervals. During all the period from his arrest to his execution, Maude exhibited the most monstrous moral depravation, justifying his crime and exulting in its commission, using the most abusive language to his counsel and the court, and threatening vengeance upon all around him. Yet at times he evinced great self-control, and showed the cool malice of a fiend.

The medical men who testified at his trial, with scarcely an exception, pronounced him a monomaniac on the subject of a conspiracy against him by his wife, sister, the priest, and the prosecution. The court charged the application of the test of "a knowledge of

right from wrong," and, in favor of "partial insanity," the theory of the prosecution, adopted the dictum of the celebrated reply of the twelve English judges, to the effect that if a person under an insane delusion as to existing facts, commit an offence in consequence thereof, he is not thereby excused, unless the act would have been justifiable had the facts been real.

Maude was convicted and sentenced, reprieved by the Governor that the Court of Pardons might examine into his case, and finally executed. His speech from the gallows has been widely published, and has gone to confirm the very general impression created by previous accounts of the homicide, that he was insane, and that his execution was a judicial mistake. There is, it seems to us, great reason to fear this dreadful presumption to be true. The man was pronounced insane before the criminal act was committed, and was confessed to be "partially insane" by all. His delusions were such as are very commonly connected with the other moral and mental manifestations in his case, and indicate a condition of profound mental disease. It is not necessary, we hope, to prove here, how entirely the dicta above noticed, as the basis of a judicial charge, fail to represent the present state of medico-legal science. If it is true that they were thus used, the fact is a deep reproach to the bench and to the legal wisdom of the country.

It is easy to believe that with such medico-legal views might be associated a moral weakness, which would permit the passions of a madman to bring down the extreme penalty of the law upon his head. We sincerely hope, that by a full and authoritative report of this trial, the public will have the means of correcting inferences so unfavorable to the wisdom and justice of American law.

---

BRIGHAM HALL, A HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE, AT CANANDAIGUA, N. Y.—The Managers of this institution, now in the fifth year since its opening, have lately published an interesting "Announcement" of its history, its organization, and present condition.

Its origin was in an association of three gentlemen, who had recognized the imperative demand for additional provision for the insane of the State, and especially for those of the more independent class. The choice of its location in the beautiful and salubrious village of Canandaigua, of its site, and of the building which has formed the nucleus of the present edifice, seems especially fortunate. In the summer of 1856, a wing was added to the original building, and a second addition of the same kind has just been completed. A description taken from the announcement, is as follows:—

“The location of the institution is upon elevated ground, about three-fourths of a mile south-west of the railway station, and commands a view of the village, lake and surrounding country. A grove of twenty acres immediately surrounding the house affords ample room for exercise, and is a never-failing source of pleasure and occupation to many patients. Fifty acres are under cultivation, about fifteen acres being appropriated to garden and fruits.

“The building is in the rural gothic style of architecture, and is composed of a central stone structure and two brick wings. The length of front is two hundred and seventy-six feet, with a depth varying from thirty-six to sixty feet. The centre-building contains the officers' residence and reception rooms; extending back from it are the kitchens, laundry and domestic offices. The engine and gas-house are placed in rear of the laundry.

“The wings are arranged exclusively for patients and their attendants. They have wide corridors with parlors, bath-rooms and closets for eighty patients.”

“From the opening of the Institution,” says the account, “to the 18th of February, 1860, there have been received one hundred and thirty-nine patients, of whom forty-two have been discharged recovered; thirty improved; seventeen unimproved, and ten have died. Forty remain under treatment, several of whom are nearly recovered.”

The act incorporating the institution was passed in April. 1859, and the organization contemplated by it was effected in August of the same year. Its Board of Managers includes gentlemen of the highest position and character, and, ex-officio, the Comptroller and Secretary of State. The organization is such as to afford every possible guarantee that the best interests of the patients will be promoted, and the Managers express their deep sense of the delicate and important trust which they have assumed.



"The medical direction of the Hospital" they say, "will be in strict conformity to those principles which experience in established asylums for the insane, and hospitals, has shown to be most conducive to the best results. The administration of the current affairs of the Hospital will be strictly upon a medical basis.

"The medical superintendence is intrusted to Dr. George Cook, who has been connected with '*Brigham Hall*' from its beginning, and Dr. John B. Chapin. They bring to the discharge of their duties an experience derived from a connection with the State Lunatic Asylum, at Utica."

---

THE PAUPER INSANE OF LONDON.—The city of London continues to occupy the anomalous and not creditable position of a large and wealthy community without an Asylum or other public provision for its Pauper Lunatics, which are still sent, by the guardians of their respective Unions, to metropolitan and other licensed houses. As the Common Council have never, by notice to the Secretary of State, taken upon themselves the duties and powers of Borough Justices, the authorities responsible for all this delay, and non-compliance with the law, are the Court of Aldermen.

The Board of Guardians of the city of London Union, prefer that their patients should be placed in a private establishment, where the proprietor has to force his profit out of the patient's maintenance, to a public asylum, where every security exists for proper care and attention to his malady, on the sole ground that the charge in one case exceeds that in the other, by the small weekly amount of one shilling per head.

The pauper lunatics belonging to the city of London are now scattered over four of the larger private houses, licensed in the metropolitan district for the reception of the insane. (*Thirteenth Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy, 31st March, 1859.*)

---

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF ASSOCIATION.—The Association of Medical Superintendents of American Institutions for the Insane will meet at the Continental Hotel, in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., on Monday, May 28th, 1860, at 10 A. M.

JOHN CURWEN, M. D., *Secretary.*

## MEDICAL JOURNALS RECEIVED.

---

Oesterreichische Zeitschrift für Practische Heilkunde. Vienna.  
 Annales Médico-Psychologiques. Paris.  
 Journal de la Physiologie de l' Homme et des Animaux. Paris.  
 Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles. Geneva.  
 Quarterly Journal of Microscopical Science. London.  
 The Dublin Medical Press. Dublin.  
 British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review. London. N. York Re-print  
 Ranking's Half-Yearly Abstract. London. Philadelphia Re-print.  
 New York Monthly Review, and Buffalo Medical Journal. Buffalo, N. Y.  
 New York Journal of Medicine. New York.  
 American Medical Gazette. New York.  
 American Medical Monthly. New York.  
 The Scalpel. New York.  
 North American Medico-Chirurgical Review. Philadelphia.  
 American Journal of the Medical Sciences. "  
 The American Journal of Dental Science. "  
 The Medical News and Library. "  
 The Medical and Surgical Reporter. "  
 The American Journal of Pharmacy. "  
 Journal of the Franklin Institute. "  
 Journal of Prison Discipline and Philanthropy. "  
 The Dental Cosmos. "  
 The American Law Register. "  
 Quarterly Summary of the Transactions of the College of Physicians of  
 Philadelphia. Philadelphia.  
 The Maryland and Virginia Medical Journal. Baltimore and Richmond.  
 The Charleston Medical Journal and Review. Charleston, S. C.  
 Atlanta Medical and Surgical Journal. Atlanta, Ga.  
 Southern Medical and Surgical Journal. Augusta, Ga.  
 Oglethorpe Medical and Surgical Journal. Savannah, Ga.  
 New Orleans Medical and Surgical Journal. New Orleans.  
 St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal. St. Louis, Mo.  
 Nashville Journal of Medicine and Surgery. Nashville, Tenn.  
 Nashville Monthly Record of Medical and Physical Science. Nashville, Tenn.  
 Cincinnati Lancet and Observer. Cincinnati, Ohio.  
 The Western Law Monthly. Cleveland, O.  
 The Chicago Medical Journal. Chicago, Ill.  
 Chicago Medical Examiner. Chicago, Ill.